This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06912821 7

ANNEXI

ANNEX I

ANNEXI

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE,

CONDUCTED

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

FOR THE YEAR 1826.

VOLUME III.

Boston:

T. R. MARVIN, PRINTER, CONGRESS STREET.

1826.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
1907

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

INDEX.

A.'s Answer to Discipulus 107
African Colony 190
Anecdotes, 27, 28, 90, 120 121, 241, 383
——— Missionary 349, 350
Apostolical Writings, Authority of 173
Art of improving life 349
Atkinson, Mrs. Mary C. Extracts from the Journal of 71
Awakened Sinner, improper instructions to an 149
Bible, effects of the 334
Brainerd 350
Celsus, reasoning employed by, against christians 214
Christ, the cross of 237
Clergyman's Life 121
Comment 179
Conscience 335
Contentment 148
Conversation at an Inn 302
Correspondents, notices to 32, 96 128, 158, 256, 352, 384
Deception or hypocrisy in death 58
Dedication 32
Depravity 117
Devotions of the Family 241
Divination 33, 65
Divine Sovereignty equitable and desirable 161
Dress the mind 336
Early Fathers, testimony of the 268
Envy and Slander 117
Erasmus and Luther 119
Error, the progress of 335
Exclusive System 179
Explanation of 1 Cor. iii. 23 17
Exposition of 1 Cor. ii. 14 166
——— of Heb. iv. 359
——— of Proverbs, xxi. 16 109
Figurative Language of the Bible, remarks on the 230
Figurative Language of prophecy, parable and metaphor, remarks on the usual method of interpreting 327
Filial Duties 180
Free Inquiry 121
God, the perfect knowledge of 39
—— the unchangeableness of 289
—— the obligation of men to acknowledge and bless, under the smiles and frowns of his providence 78
Gospel, faithfully exhibited, the occasion of divisions among men 47
Gospel Holiness 296
Hints to Parishioners 335
Hopoo, Thomas 383
Ignatius, Epistle of to Polycarp 117
Inquiry into the meaning of Romans, ix. 3 10
Inspiration 27
Intelligence,
Missionary 59, 91, 122, 255
Religious 30, 94, 123, 253
Jacobs, Dr. Memoir of 13
Lord's Supper, an ordinance of the church 202
Lotteries, candid remarks on 344
Men ought always to pray 128
Ministers' pronouncing the benediction 281
Ministry, effect of a people on the 309
Mistake corrected 121
Modern Charity 208
N. Reply to, on christians' praying for perfection 278
N.'s reply to J. Anona 361
Notes of Thanks, &c. 213
Obituary Notices,
Rev. Dr. Bogue 126
Rev. Mr. Fisk 125
Rev. Mr. Frost 188
Rev. Mr. Hall 350
Mrs. Knight 125
Rev. Mr. Sessions 190
Ordinations and Installations 32, 63 127, 157, 192, 255, 288, 351, 384
Outcasts of Israel 274, 297
Parochial Visits 151
Pilgrim's Progress in the 19th century 23, 83, 182, 209, 282 304, 331, 362

Pious Family and christian soldiers 287
Poetry 64, 128, 157, 256
Polygamy 178
Popular Opinion, influence of, on the pulpit 235
Prayer 395
——— Thoughts on 177, 207, 295
Question 59
Reasoning in sermons 116
Religious Publications,
Rev. D. A. Clark's sermon 252
Rev. E. Cornelius' sermon 253
Request 59
Review of Rev. Mr. Whitman's sermon 217, 243, 257, 309, 369
Rogers, John, the Proto-martyr 152
Rules, general to assist a young student in divinity 301
Sabbath, thoughts on the 18, 51
Sabbath-breaker, thoughts on the death of 337
Saints, is it the duty of to pray for perfection in holiness 199
Saints, testimony of the scriptures to the perseverance of 134
Sermons 1, 97, 193, 225, 321
Sin,—not a punishment 77
Sins of ignorance, what is intended by 140
Strange sight 28
Subject proposed 116
System, the benefits of in religious charities 111
Texts, origin of 338
Town Clerk of Ephesus 241
Transatlantic Recollections 215
Unbelief, the criminality of 43
Unconditional Submission, objections to considered 339
Unitarians versus the New Testament 382
Unprofitable Business 242
Use of Means 238
Wealth, a good expedient for the preservation of 336
Xanthus, reply to 142

* Mark 10:22 — 1
Eccl. 5:15 — 97
Ps. 104:24 — 193, 225,
Rev. 16:29-32 — 321.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. JANUARY, 1826. No. 1.

SERMON.

MARK, X. 22.—*And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.*

Our Saviour taught as one having authority. His preaching raised the admiration of some, and the curiosity of many. Multitudes of all denominations and classes of men followed him from place to place; some scribes who were teachers, some Pharisees who were sober and strict in their lives, some Sadducees who were lax in their sentiments, some publicans and sinners who were openly vicious in their practice, and some rulers who were the principal men in the nation. Of the class last mentioned, a young ruler of an amiable appearance and deportment, came to him with this serious and important question, "Good master, What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus having directed him to keep the commandments, he promptly replied, "Master, all these have I observed from my youth. Then Jesus beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, one thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross and follow me. And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions."

This declaration of Christ instantaneously stripped the young man of all his fond hopes of future happiness; for he was conscious that he never had, and thought that he never could, exercise that *disinterested* love, which Christ required as an indispensable condition of salvation. He was grieved, that he could not obtain heavenly treasures, without giving up his worldly possessions. He supposed, that he could never be saved on the condition which Christ proposed. The spirit of the text, therefore, leads us to conclude,

That sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of *disinterested* love. I shall,

I. Show that disinterested love is the condition of salvation.

II. Show that sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition.

I. I am to show that disinterested love is the condition, upon which salvation is offered to sinners in the word of God. If we look into the Old Testament we shall find, that God requires pure, supreme, disinterested love, as the condition of his peculiar favour both in this life and in that which is to come. Moses having called all the people of God together, says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord:

and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart." The love which God here requires as the condition of temporal and spiritual favours, is the same disinterested love, upon which Christ says all the law and prophets do hang. Our Saviour abundantly inculcated *disinterested* love as the condition of salvation. In his sermon on the mount, he insisted largely upon the nature and necessity of *disinterested* love, in opposition to the *selfish* principles and practices of the scribes and Pharisees. "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you. And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also so to them likewise. For if ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to those of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Our Lord also spake a parable, on purpose to show, that no man can be saved upon *selfish* principles, and consequently, that *disinterested* love is the only condition of salvation. "The ground," says he, "of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater: and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years: take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee: then whose shall all those things be which thou has provided? So is he that layeth up treasure *for himself*, and is not rich toward God." It was one of Christ's common sayings, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." This was saying in the plainest and strongest terms, that disinterested love is the only condition of salvation. He said, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." When a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live. But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?" In answer to this, Christ spake the

parable of the good Samaritan, and said to the querist, "Go and do thou likewise;" that is, Go and exercise the same *disinterested* benevolence, and thou shalt be saved. But that nothing short of disinterested love is the condition of salvation, the Apostle Paul plainly asserts and strikingly illustrates in the thirteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. "Though, says he, I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." By charity the Apostle means that charity which seeketh not her own, or that *disinterested* love, which stands directly opposed to all *selfish* affections, exercises, and actions. It is true indeed, both Christ and the apostles represent either faith, or repentance, or submission, as entitling any one to salvation. But it is to be remembered, that all those exercises are only so many different modifications and expressions of that love, which is *disinterested*. So that if we search through the Bible, we shall find that disinterested benevolence, in some form or other, is the only condition, upon which eternal life is offered to sinners. I now proceed to show,

II. That sinners are ready to think it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition. So the young man supposed. At first he thought he was in a fair way to heaven. But as soon as Christ mentioned *disinterested* love as the condition of eternal life, his heart and his hopes failed him, he went away grieved and desponding, and supposing it to be impracticable to comply with the terms of salvation which Christ proposed. Nor was he alone in this opinion; for those who stood by and heard the condition, expressed the same sentiment, and with astonishment exclaimed, "Who then can be saved?" When Christ reproved those who followed him for the sake of the loaves, and implicitly told them, that they must exercise disinterested love in order to obtain his favour, "They said, this is a hard saying, who *can hear it?* And from that time, many of his disciples went back and followed him no more." They felt as though they never could be saved upon the condition of *disinterested* love. While Paul supposed the divine law required nothing but selfishness, he felt blameless, and entertained high hopes of heaven; but when his mind was enlightened and his conscience awakened to understand the true meaning of the law, he saw his selfishness condemned by it, and despaired of mercy upon the condition of disinterested love. The single prohibition, which says, "Thou shalt not *covet*," that is, thou shalt not be *selfish*, carried death to his hope; because he supposed it was impossible for such a selfish creature as he found himself to be, to exercise that disinterested love to which the promise of salvation is made. Such have been the views of all sinners in the same situation. They have found it easy to love themselves supremely, but to love God more than themselves, and to prefer

his glory to their own eternal happiness, they have found to be extremely difficult, even as difficult as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle. They have really supposed it to be absolutely impossible for them to exercise that pure, disinterested love, to which the promise of salvation is made to them in the gospel.

But here it may be proper to inquire, why they think it is impossible to be saved on the condition of *disinterested* benevolence. They must see something in disinterested love, which is totally different from all *selfish* affections; otherwise they could not imagine it to be so extremely difficult to exercise it. But it is certain, in the first place, that their difficulty in exercising *disinterested* love, does not arise from its being *unreasonable.* God is as worthy to be loved as themselves. Christ is as worthy to be loved as themselves. And their fellow-men are as worthy to be loved as themselves. It is, therefore, altogether reasonable, that they should love God supremely, and their fellow-men as themselves. And they always approve of disinterested love, wherever they think they see it acted out. Nor do they ever fail of blaming themselves as well as others, for feeling and expressing selfishness in any form whatever. The young ruler did not presume to object against disinterested affections and actions as unreasonable or absurd. Indeed, it is not in the power of the human mind to discover any thing improper or absurd in universal, impartial, and disinterested benevolence. Reason dictates, that this is the only proper and virtuous affection, that rational creatures can exercise towards their Creator and one another. If there were any thing inconsistent, improper, or absurd in sinners exercising disinterested benevolence, they might well suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition. But this is not the case, nor can they consistently pretend this to be the case, for they always approve of others for acting from disinterested motives.

Nor again, do sinners suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested benevolence, because there is no need of their having such benevolent affections, in order to be completely and eternally happy. They know the nature of selfishness, which tends to make rational beings miserable. And sometimes they are convinced by their own experience, that with their present feelings it is impossible for them to be happy in this life, or the next. And this is the real truth. No individual, or number of individuals, can be in a state of solid, permanent happiness, without that pure, disinterested love, which the gospel requires. It appears absolutely necessary, therefore, that God should require disinterested love from all the subjects of his holy, happy kingdom. If God means to make his rational creatures happy, he must do it on the principle of disinterested benevolence. This sinners are capable of seeing; and of course they cannot suppose, that God unnecessarily imposes on them the hard condition of disinterested love in order to escape the wrath to come, and enjoy the blessedness of heaven. Though the young ruler was grieved when he heard the condition of salvation, yet Christ was not severe, but kind and compassionate, in pointing out to him the only possible way of inherit-

ing eternal life. And he does not appear to blame Christ on this account. Nor can any sinners justly view this condition of salvation, as an unnecessary hardship. Their reason and conscience, notwithstanding the depravity of their hearts, tell them, that disinterested love is not only a reasonable, but a necessary condition of their being freed from all misery, and put into the enjoyment of all good. No other qualification can possibly prepare them for the inheritance of the saints in light.

Nor again, do sinners suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love, because they know themselves to be *incapable* of exercising such a holy affection. They are conscious of being able to love and hate, choose and refuse; and to exercise *benevolent* as well as *malevolent* affections. The amiable young man was possessed of all the rational powers, which were necessary to perform the most benevolent actions. This appears from his own declaration, that he had externally obeyed all the divine commands from his youth. It was completely in his power to comply with the conditions of salvation which Christ proposed. He was able to sell all he had, and convert it to benevolent purposes, and to take up his cross and follow him. For this was soon after actually done, by the primitive christians; and the most worldly-minded, selfish sinners are equally capable of exercising pure, disinterested benevolence.

The question still returns, why do sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love? After what has been said, there seems to be but one plain, positive, satisfactory answer to be given to this question. Sinners think, it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love, because of the total depravity and selfishness of their hearts. This the young man most sensibly felt. "He was very much grieved, because he was very rich, and supremely attached to the world." He could not bear to give up his great possessions for the sake of Christ, or for the sake of the gospel, or for the sake of the salvation of his own soul. It is as hard to the selfish heart of one sinner as to the selfish heart of another; to give up all his earthly treasure, for the sake of having treasure in heaven. Every sinner has a carnal mind, which no motives taken from time or eternity can reconcile to God and to the terms of salvation proposed in the gospel. For while he loves himself supremely, he cannot be willing to give up his present and future happiness, for the glory of God and the good of the universe; he cannot be willing to lose his life, that he may find it, or to leave it to the wise, holy, and sovereign will of God, to save or destroy him, though he knows this is his duty, and would secure his salvation, if he would only exercise such pure, supreme, disinterested love to God. The entire selfishness of sinners, therefore, convinces them, that it is morally impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love.

IMPROVEMENT.

1. If it be entirely owing to the selfishness of sinners, that they suppose they cannot be saved on the condition of disinterested love; then their inability to embrace the gospel is alto-

gether criminal and inexcusable. It is true, that they are under one kind of inability to love God, to repent of sin, to believe in Christ, or to do any thing in a right and acceptable manner. This we are plainly taught in scripture. Moses told the corrupt and totally selfish Israelites, "Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is an holy God." Christ said, "No man can come to me, except the Father who sent me draw him." And the Apostle declares, "The carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be: so then they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." But this is a *moral* inability, which arises from the free, voluntary, selfish exercises of the heart, and is in its own nature entirely sinful and inexcusable. There is an essential difference between *moral* and *natural* inability. If sinners were incapable of distinguishing selfishness from benevolence, they would be under a natural inability of exercising that benevolence, to which the promise of salvation is made, and this would be a sufficient excuse for not complying with the terms of the gospel. But they know, that selfishness and benevolence are totally different in their nature and tendency, and that the former is sinful and the latter is virtuous. "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Sinners have no right to plead sin as an excuse for sin, or to plead selfishness as an excuse for not exercising that pure disinterested love to God and man, which the gospel requires as an indispensable condition of salvation. When they plead, as they almost universally do, their inability to love God and embrace the gospel, they plead no other than a *moral* inability, which arises from their entire selfishness, which is the essence of all sin and criminality, and which is no better excuse than Satan has for hating God and all good, with all his heart. If they would only express their inability in plain and intelligible language, they would say they love themselves so much, that they cannot love God, that they love selfishness so much, that they cannot love benevolence, that they love the happiness of this world so much, that they cannot love the enjoyment of God and the happiness of heaven. And this inability, instead of excusing them, must condemn them in the sight of God, and their own consciences.

2. It appears from what has been said, that sinners have no ground to think God is *insincere* in offering them salvation upon the condition of disinterested benevolence. Sinners think and often say, that there can be no sincerity in God's offering to save them, upon unreasonable and impracticable terms. They say he knows, that they cannot and will not accept of salvation, upon the condition of disinterested love; and therefore he cannot be sincere in offering them salvation upon terms which he knows they cannot and will not comply with. We could not indeed see any sincerity in God's offering salvation to sinners on the condition, that they should ascend into heaven, (that is, to bring Christ down from above,) or that they should descend into the deep, (that is, to bring up Christ from the dead,) for it is naturally impossible for them to perform these conditions. But what saith God to every sinner? "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth; that is the word of faith which we

ch; that if thou shalt con- with thy mouth the Lord Je- and shalt believe in thine t that God hath raised him the dead, thou shalt be sav-

Thus God offers salvation ıners in the gospel, on the st and easiest terms possible. ıing can prevent their ac- ıng salvation, but their freely voluntarily rejecting it.

It is of importance, that God ld offer salvation to sinners on condition of disinterested be- lence, though he knows be- ıand, that they will reject ffer. The condition is easy practicable. They are able ought to exercise disinterest- enevolence, and nothing can r them from exercising it, their totally depraved and h hearts. They are, how- , naturally blind to their na- depravity and selfishness. y are not willing to believe, they hate God, hate Christ, holiness, and hate salvation ; until they are brought to trial. God brings them to rial, by freely and sincerely ing them salvation, upon the and gracious condition of dis- ested love, which he knows hate and will absolutely re- to exercise, though they are ble their refusal will prove destruction. There is no r way, by which God can ınstrate to sinners themselves o the universe, that they are y depraved, selfish, and op- l to all good, but by his of- ; them salvation upon the tion of *disinterested* benevo- , and *their* refusing it. The ble young man, whom Jesus lding loved, would always per- in this world, have appear- ry different, if *Christ* had not ed, and *he* had not rejected tion, on the condition of *dis-interested* benevolence. He never appeared so perfectly *selfish* to himself, nor to others, before he rejected salvation, rather than to give up his possessions and give God the supreme affection of his heart.

4. Since *disinterested* benevolence is the only condition of salvation, there is no propriety in directing sinners *how* to embrace the gospel. They are not very often satisfied with being told, that disinterested love is the only condition, upon which they can find acceptance with God; they want to know how they shall exercise this pure, holy love. But it does not belong to the preachers of the gospel to answer this impertinent and absurd question. It is sufficient for them clearly to state the condition of salvation, and leave it to sinners to find out how they shall freely and voluntarily perform it. Christ did no more than this, in preaching the gospel to the young man. He plainly and intelligibly taught him disinterested love, and promised him salvation on condition of his exercising and expressing such a holy, virtuous affection. The young man clearly understood the condition, for it grieved him to the heart, to be required to give up all his selfish feelings and possessions in order to be saved. But though Christ saw his anxiety and distress, he did not undertake to tell him *how* he should become willing to sell all he had and give to the poor, and come and follow him. He knew how to love God supremely as well as he knew how to love himself and the world supremely. Sinners know how to love God supremely, as well as to hate him supremely. They know how to love God supremely, as well as to love the world supremely.

They know how to exercise benevolence, as well as to exercise selfishness. If the young man had asked Christ how he should become willing to give up all and follow him, and become truly benevolent, he would not have told him, any more than he could have told him how to go away grieved. All that the ministers of the gospel have to tell sinners, is, the *condition* upon which they may be saved, and not *how to be willing* to perform that condition. All who pretend to do this, undertake to do what they have no right, nor power to do.

5. Since disinterested benevolence is the only condition of salvation, ministers have no right to substitute any other or lower conditions of salvation. This is what many preachers of the gospel presume to do. After they have stated the only condition of salvation, and told sinners they must do what Christ required the young man to do in order to be saved, sinners generally complain that they cannot perform that condition. Their hearts, they say, are totally depraved, and they cannot exercise disinterested benevolence, and love God supremely; of course they ask what they must do to get disinterested benevolence, or a heart to love God supremely? Many ministers see no other way to relieve sinners in this deplorable situation, than to alter and lower the terms of salvation, and direct and advise them to do something which their depraved hearts are willing to do in order to get a good heart, and exercise true benevolence.

6. Since disinterested love is the only condition of salvation, we may see why this doctrine is more disagreeable to all sinners, than any other doctrine of the gospel. All the doctrines of the gospel clearly understood are disagreeable to sinners, because they are all founded on disinterested benevolence. But as they do not generally see, that the doctrine of decrees, the doctrine of election, the doctrine of divine agency, the doctrine of unconditional submission, and various other doctrines, are founded on disinterested benevolence, so they do not dislike those doctrines so much as the doctrine on which they are founded. This comes directly and sensibly across all their selfish desires, exertions, and hopes. They cannot love God, because he is a holy God. They cannot serve God because he is a holy God. They cannot please God, because he is a holy God. They cannot go backward, nor forward, nor stand still, without offending God. They find that every imagination of the thoughts of their hearts is evil, and only evil continually, and a transgression of that holy law, which requires pure disinterested love. All sinners of all descriptions are equally and totally opposed to that disinterested benevolence, which is the condition of salvation. Not only publicans and sinners, but scribes and Pharisees, who were externally righteous and apparently religious, were all opposed to the doctrine of disinterested benevolence, as it was plainly taught and inculcated by Christ. They were all ready to exclaim, "Who then can be saved?" All sinners now have the same opposition to this doctrine, that others have felt and expressed; for it strikes at the root of every false scheme of religion, and every false hope of salvation. All sinners whether Calvinists or Arminians, whether Unitarians or Universalists, wheth-

er externally religious or irreligious, whether awakened or unawakened are equally opposed to disinterested benevolence.—They can explain away all other doctrines on selfish principles so as to suit them; but they cannot explain away the doctrine of disinterested benevolence, upon any selfish principle, and therefore Arminians, moderate Calvinists, Methodists, Unitarians, and Universalists unitedly deny it, and exclaim, "Who then can be saved?" They virtually acknowledge, if disinterested benevolence be true, their different schemes of religion are false, and their hopes built upon them are false and fatal. And to give up a favourite scheme or a false hope, is like giving up the ghost. It carries death and despair in it to the best and worst of sinners. Let any doctrine of the gospel be clearly traced to its foundation, that is, disinterested benevolence, and every sinner in the world, will hate and oppose it. Let Christ's precept, requiring us, "to do to others as we would, that others should do to us" be justly explained and understood, and it would be as generally hated and opposed, as the doctrine of total depravity, or the doctrine of election, or the doctrine of unconditional submission, for it is as plainly founded in disinterested benevolence as those doctrines are. In a word, all the reason, why sinners dislike and oppose any doctrines and duties of the gospel, is because they see or think they see, that they require that disinterested love, of which they are conscious they are destitute.

7. Since disinterested love is the only condition of salvation, it is vain and dangerous for secure sinners to wait for a more convenient season to embrace the gospel and secure the salvation of their souls. There are many sinners in this waiting posture. They intend to do what the gospel requires them to do in order to be saved, and have no doubt that they shall be able and willing to do whatever is necessary to be done to obtain eternal life when a favourable season presents. But if they would only consider that the condition of salvation is disinterested love, and that their own hearts are totally selfish, they would renounce the hope of a more convenient season of complying with that condition. Neither prosperity nor adversity, neither health nor sickness, nor the nearest prospect of death, would have the least tendency to change their hearts from selfishness to love. A season of trouble, affliction, and bereavement may come; or a season of awakenings and convictions may come; and these seasons may throw them into great anxiety and distress, and constrain them to cry, "What must we do to be saved?" But no other proper answer can be given them but that which requires them to love God supremely, or exercise disinterested benevolence. This their depraved, selfish hearts will tell them in a moment, it is morally impossible for them to do. They will therefore, either sink in sadness, grief, and despondence, or rise in vigorous enmity and opposition to God and the condition of salvation, quenching the spirit and stifling conviction. And in this deplorable situation, God may leave them to pine away and perish in their sins forever, as he has left thousands of other incorrigible sinners. No impenitent sinners have any ground to hope

or wait for a more convenient season to turn from selfishness to benevolence, and embrace the gospel; for such a season never will come. But,

8. Though it be morally impossible for sinners to exercise that disinterested love, which is the indispensable condition of salvation; yet it is not *naturally* impossible for them to be saved. This Christ observed, when the young man went away sad and hopeless of eternal life, on the condition of disinterested benevolence. "Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that *trust* in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them, saith, With *men* it is impossible, but not with *God*; for with *God* all things are possible." Though sinners are naturally dead in trespasses and sins; though they have a carnal mind which is enmity to God and not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; though they choose eternal death, rather than eternal life, upon the condition of disinterested love; yet God is able, in the day of his power, *to make them willing* to renounce their supreme attachment to themselves and to the world, and to accept salvation on the gracious and humiliating condition of disinterested benevolence. No sinner knows what God determines to do with him; but let God's determination be what it may, his duty is to throw himself into his holy and sovereign hand, and penitently cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

Though the following article has been recently published in the Christian Spectator, yet, as it was communicated to us in Manuscript, by the Author, we think it expedient, considering its merits, to give it a place in the Christian Magazine.

For the Christian Magazine.

INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING OF ROMANS, IX. 3.

"*I could wish that I were accursed from Christ, for my brethren.*"

This sentence expresses an intensity of feeling seldom exhibited, and is accompanied with a solemn appeal to the Searcher of hearts. On such an occasion, Paul probably used words according to their obvious and common acceptation. The precise import of these words is the subject of our present inquiry.

Ηυχομην εγω, *I could wish.* This verb has the form of the indicative imperfect; but as is often the case, it is evidently used for the subjunctive. The connexion shows that Paul is speaking, not of his past, but of his present feelings.

"I could wish," ειναι αναθεμα, *to be accursed.* The word *anathema* is of Greek origin, and according to its etymology signifies *to set apart, to separate*, and answers to the Hebrew word חֵרֶם which means *separated from a common use*, and either *devoted exclusively to God*, or *devoted to utter destruction.* This word is found in the Old Testament forty times. In eight places it denotes *consecration*

to God, and in thirty-two places it means *abandoned by God*, and is translated in our English version, *accursed*, *a curse*, or *utter destruction*. In twenty places it has reference to the extermination of the Canaanites, and wherever it is used, it is emphatic, and generally is applied to idolatrous nations, as objects of divine wrath. Thus in Isaiah, "My sword shall be bathed in heaven, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my *curse* to judgment."

The Greek word αναθεμα is used only six times in the New Testament. Those Jews who imprecated on themselves the direst vengeance of heaven, if they eat before they had killed Paul, as it stands in the original, "anathematized themselves with anathemas." Paul uses the word five times. "No man speaking by the Spirit calleth Christ anathema." "If any man preach another gospel, let him be anathema." This he repeats, "If any man love not Christ, let him be anathema." These citations show that this was the most emphatic word among the Jews, to denote complete separation from the favour of God; and that in Paul's mind, it was most vividly associated with the thought of eternal perdition.

"I could wish myself accursed." απο του Χριστου, "an anathema from Christ." What does απο του Χριστου mean in this connexion? The word Anathema, when used in the sense of *consecration*, is commonly followed by the dative case, (Lev. 27: 28. Mic. 4: 13.) but when used in the sense of being accursed, excepting the passage under consideration, it is not followed by any case. As this word is employed to designate the idea of separation, as well as destruction, the most natural rendering of the preposition απο, is *from*. A passage of similar construction is found in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, "punished with everlasting destruction, απο του προσωπου, *from the presence of the Lord*." The word here translated *destruction*, is ολεθρον, derived from the verb ολλυμι, which is often used in the Septuagint as synonymous with *anathema*.

Some, however, suppose that απο του Χριστου, in our text, ought to be translated *after the example of Christ*, and that would make the sentence run thus, *I could wish myself to be an anathema, as Christ was an anathema*, referring to his crucifixion. But to this there is a serious objection; for though Paul says Christ was made καταρα, that is a *curse* for us, yet he says, "No man speaking by the Spirit calleth Christ *anathema*." With this passage before our eyes, it is difficult to see how Paul could apply the term *anathema*, in any sense, to Christ.

Others suppose that απο του Χριστου means *by Christ*, and would translate the passage, "I am willing to endure all kinds of temporal evils inflicted by Christ." To this I reply, the word anathema is used eight times in the Bible to denote entire consecration to God; above forty times it denotes destruction without remedy; but is never applied to crucifixion, trials, persecutions, the hidings of God's face, or any other class of sufferings inflicted on the children of God.

These remarks, I trust, have shown that the plain meaning of the expression αναθεμα απο του Χριστου, is *eternal separation from the Messiah's kingdom*. That this is the more obvious meaning no critic ever denied. But many have objected to the sentiment as being inconsistent, impossible, or

absurd. To these objections, and any others like them, I have one plain answer to give.

Our benevolent desires are not limited by our power to do good. Paul was not coldly deliberating about the power or consistency of exchanging his condition with that of his unbelieving brethren; but he had a most ardent and intense desire for their salvation; a vivid and distinct emotion filled his bosom—he uttered it just as it arose in his mind. What though it was a desire which he had no power to accomplish? When death is near, and the expiring sinner sees the pit opening to receive him, he has often exclaimed, "I would give all the world for the salvation of my soul." This surely is not an irrational state of feeling. And yet to talk of purchasing heaven by the world, that is by the treasures which the world contains, is to propose an evident impossibility.

Paul is not the only instance of deep and intense feeling for others. The Israelites, ere the thunderings of Sinai had ceased, prostrated themselves before the calf that Aaron made. The wrath of God waxed hot against them. Moses saw this people, whom he had conducted from Egypt, whom he loved as the favourites of heaven, and with whom was most intimately connected the glory of God,—he saw them about to be swept away by the displeasure of the Almighty. He did not stand and look on calm and unmoved. "O forgive this people, and, if not, blot me out of the book thou hast written." Were this the only place where the expression, "blot me out of thy book," occurred, we could be at no loss what Moses intended to express, in this moment of overwhelming sorrow. God replies, "Him that *sinneth* I will blot out of my book." No one can doubt what God means by "blotting the sinner out of his book," and surely he means the same thing that Moses did in the preceding verse.

Having endeavoured to show, in a philological way, the obvious import of the passage under consideration, and that no objection to this interpretation is valid, I proceed to adduce other considerations to confirm the views that have been given.

The moment before Paul uttered the text in question, he was contemplating the safety of those who are united to Christ. The joys of the redeemed, through unnumbered ages, are unfolded to his vision. His eye glances over universal nature—on the earth, in the heights above, in the depths beneath, no enemy is able to separate them from a Saviour's love. But his brethren who are Israelites, to whom pertain the covenants and the promises, have rejected the Messiah, and are liable to be forever separated from his kingdom. And while he beholds, in prospect, multitudes descending to the world of woe, he *feels* for them. How much? A modern critic says enough to suffer the pangs of crucifixion. Another says, enough to endure those temporal calamities that were impending over the city of Jerusalem. But did not the whole tenor of Paul's life evince that afflictions and persecutions were nothing to him compared with future glory? Was he not ever ready to die for the Gentile, as well as for the Jew? Was not death, in any shape, a welcome messenger to him? How then could a willingness to suffer *these evils* express a peculiar and vehement love for his brethren, the Jews?

learn from his diary, with what joy he watched the indications of its approach, and with what fervency he prayed for the progress and prevalence of the work. In the following instance of supplication, he shows the state of his mind, and the benevolence of his affections. "O thou most adorable Redeemer! I would give thee glory in the highest for the present appearances. Four or five of the unthinking part of my young friends are now inquiring what they shall do to be saved. Do thou, dear Savior, perfect the work which thou hast begun. Be merciful to this Church and Congregation, and to the Israel of God. Bring in thine own elect—even so Lord Jesus, Amen and Amen."

In the early part of this revival, the Christian friends of the young Mr. Jacobs were at a loss to know how to judge of him. He was not awakened, distressed, and to appearance changed, as others were; neither so far as they knew, had this ever been the case with him. Yet he seemed to be, and, no doubt, really was, highly interested and engaged in the work, and lost no opportunity either of enjoying or promoting it. At length, however, the truth could not be concealed. He opened his heart freely to his intimate friends, and gave them much reason to believe, that for some considerable time—from some unknown period of his youth, he had been a Christian. His light, which he lamented had been so long concealed, now shone forth with increasing brightness; and, on the third of March, 1817, in company with fifteen others, he openly professed himself on the Lord's side. On this occasion, he writes thus in his diary; "This has been to me a solemn and important day indeed. I have joined myself to the visible church, and the vows of God are upon me. Thanks to my glorious Saviour, I was enabled to enjoy sweet communion with him, at his table. I know not that I ever enjoyed myself so much in my life before."

In the summer of 1818, having completed his professional studies, and been regularly licensed as a practising Physician, he removed and established himself at Oakham. Here he remained, till the period of his death. Although his professional business was very considerable, and his practice, for aught that appears, was uniformly satisfactory to his employers and friends, still it was not merely in the character of a Physician, that he distinguished himself, and became eminently useful. He shone also as a Christian; and as a Christian of no ordinary attainments. In conversing and praying with the sick, he was able, tender and pertinent.—In the Sabbath school—in the Prayer meeting and Conference room—indeed, in every place where he had an opportunity to do good, he was almost uniformly present, and ready, if called upon, to attempt it. Still, his piety was rather retiring than otherwise—he knew his place—and never affected to be wiser than his religious teachers or superiors. He wished every thing in religion to be done "decently and in order." By unremitted exertions for the benefit both of the body and the soul, he greatly endeared himself to the serious people among whom he resided, as well as to a more extended circle of acquaintances and friends.

But he was not exempt from the common fate of men. He

was fast accomplishing his work on earth, and preparing for a removal to higher scenes. In the autumn of 1824, he was attacked with a fever, which soon deprived him of his reason, and, in a few weeks terminated his earthly existence. Not many months before his death, he was married to the only daughter of Rev. Mr. Tomlinson, of Oakham, whom he has left, a lonely and afflicted widow, to deplore her loss.

There are several respects, in which Dr. Jacobs deserves to be exhibited as an example to survivors.—One of these is, his *early piety*. He remembered his Creator in the days of his youth. He seemed to have little inclination for the common amusements of the young, and gave his earliest and best days to the service of the Redeemer. He even commenced writing his religious exercises, when he was little more than a child. Still, he was led by the Holy Spirit in such a way as to keep him humble. The impression that he was an *extraordinary youth*, under which some young Christians have unhappily fallen, and of which nothing but bitter experience in future years will ordinarily rid them, it is not known that he ever received.

It was eminently true of Doct. Jacobs, as appears from his diary, that he *acknowledged God in all his ways*. In several instances, we find him dedicating himself to God, and writing and signing the act of self-consecration, with his own hand. Indeed, this seems to have been his constant practice, at the beginning of the year.—He noticed the hand of God in the preservation of his life; and with this view his successive *birth days* were observed as seasons of special solemnity. On one of them, he writes as follows: "I am now twenty two years of age. Thus far hath the Lord led me on—thus far hath he preserved me. I give thee glory, O Lord, for all the mercies I have received from thee, the year past—above all, for the light of thy countenance, and the continued supplies of thine Holy Spirit. . . . Have I considered properly, and as I ought, that all my ways are ordered by God—and that every thing I have experienced, whether in prosperity or affliction, is a part of his eternal counsel? Have I been duly thankful to God for his goodness to me, with respect both to temporal and spiritual favours—considering that they all come through the intercession of my blessed Redeemer? Have I been, and am I now, humble, in any measure as I ought to be for my ingratitude and extreme sinfulness? Have I grown any better, the year past? Have I increased in any of the Christian graces and virtues? My blessed Redeemer, I feel that I am nothing. Be thou in me, and unto me, all things that I need."—He devoutly acknowledged the hand of God, in all the leading and in most of the common events of his life. Thus when about to offer himself for examination and license to practise medicine, we find him referring the case to God, and seeking his direction and blessing. Afterwards, when contemplating a removal to a particular place, he writes, "O Lord God Almighty, if it is thy will that I go to ———, do thou prepare the way for it. But if it is not for my good and thy glory, do thou prevent it. Do thou mete out the lot of my habitation for me. Direct my thoughts and my feet, and lead me, as thou didst Abraham of old." And afterwards, when established in the

practice of medicine, there is scarcely a case of difficulty noted in his journal, in respect to which he does not seek the direction and blessing of God. Indeed prayer had become to him, in a sense, habitual; and wherever he went, or whatever he undertook, the object before him was made, of course, the subject of prayer.

It may be seen from the example under consideration, that the practice of the medical profession need not, in ordinary cases, interfere with an attendance on the means of grace. Doct. Jacobs had many calls, as a Physician. The extent of his practice, for one of his years and standing, was respectable. Yet he seldom was absent, either from the house of God, or from meetings for religious conference and prayer. He so planned and arranged his professional visits, as to make them consist with an almost uniform attendance upon the means of grace. We think other Physicians, if they were similarly disposed, might be able, in most cases, to do the same.

The benefit of a *pious* Physician among a people, is also strongly illustrated in the case before us. Doct. Jacobs was scarcely more useful in his profession, than as an enlightened and judicious Christian. In his visits to the sick, he was able to instruct them, and if requested, to pray with them. He thus administered comfort to the soul, as well as help to the body. In different parts of the town, where his business called him, he ever appeared in character as a Christian. His influence was strong, and it was uniformly exerted in favor of the truth. Both by precept and example, he studied to recommend and enforce the religion of the Saviour. In a season of revival in Oakham, during his residence there, his labours were great, and were greatly blessed. The happy results of them can never be estimated, till they are seen in the light of the judgment day. The good people in that place will not soon forget the earnestness with which he pleaded for them before the throne of grace, or his benevolent exertions to promote their spiritual and eternal welfare.—In view of an example such as this, how important it appears, that Physicians should be *pious men!* What class in society have better opportunities of usefulness? What class have the means of accomplishing greater good? May the spirit of grace soon be poured upon the Physicians of our country, that those who are called to prescribe for the diseased body, may be qualified also to administer consolation to the never dying soul.

The subject of the preceding remarks may be exhibited to all classes of readers, as one who made religion the business of every day, and who carried it with him into all the duties and avocations of life. He did not regard the world as the principal thing, and the concerns of the soul, as a mere secondary object. He did not attend to religion, or converse about it, merely to fill up intervals of time, when he had nothing else to do, or to say. But he was one of the happy few, who not only seek, but *seem* to seek, first and chiefly, the kingdom of God and his righteousness —who, feeling that they have been redeemed at an inestimable price, make it their study and endeavour to glorify God, in their bodies and spirits which are his. —When will Christians generally

become more wise on this subject? When will they so live, that beholders may *see*, that they regard not chiefly those things which are seen and temporal, but those which are not seen and eternal—that all around may take knowledge of them, that they have been with Jesus? E.

For the Christian Magazine.

AN EXPLANATION OF 1ST CORINTHIANS, III. 23.

"*And ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.*"

The most important question relative to the meaning of these words, and that in the solution of which every reader feels the deepest interest is doubtless this: *In what sense is Christ God's?* That he is God's, in some sense or other, the express language of the Apostle places beyond all doubt. "And ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." If we attend a moment to the two preceding verses with which this passage is intimately connected, we shall see that Christ is God's, in the same general sense in which all things else are said to be the believer's. "Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Now in what sense were Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, and the world, and life, and death, and things present, and things to come, the property of believers at Corinth? To this it is replied, they were all, either directly or indirectly, instrumental of promoting the good of these believers. It is not known that they were, in any other sense, *theirs*, than as they were the means, or the instruments of promoting their good. In the same general sense, these believers were Christ's: they were instrumental in promoting the glory of Christ. In the same sense, Christ himself is God's: he is instrumental of promoting the glory of God. The plain import of the passage, "Ye are Christ's and Christ is God's," is, therefore, this; "*The Church is subservient to the glory of Christ, and Christ subservient to the glory of God, as all things else are to the good of the Church.*" As an illustration of this truth, it might easily be shown. 1st. That all things are subservient to the good of the Church. 2d. That the Church is subservient to the glory of Christ. 3d. That Christ is subservient to the glory of God. But to most of my readers, these propositions are too plain to need any particular illustration. It is thought that merely naming them presents the sense of the text so fully, as to render any further explanation superfluous.

But here some may be ready to inquire, whether the fact that Christ is God's, even if he be his, in the sense above explained, does not imply that he is inferior to God? In reply to this question, I admit that Christ, in his official capacity as Mediator between God and man, is inferior to God. When he took upon him the office of Mediator, he *humbled* himself, and voluntarily consented to act a part, in the work of redemption, subordinate to the Father. Accordingly we learn from Scripture, that although he was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God; he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being

found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." But the fact, that Christ sustains an office in the work of redemption below that of God the Father, that he has voluntarily become his servant, and, in his office as Mediator, is instrumental of promoting his glory, does not prove that he is originally, or by nature, inferior to him. The circumstance that Christ is said to be "God's," in the passage under consideration, no more proves that he is by nature unequal to the Father, than the expression just preceding it, "all things are yours," proves, that Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, who are included in these all things, were inferior to the Corinthians. These Apostles were, indeed, in the gospel of Christ, servants to the Corinthians, and as such were instrumental in promoting their good. On this account they are, with propriety, said to be theirs. But all this is perfectly consistent with their being naturally equal, and even superior to them. So Christ, who voluntarily consented to perform the office of Mediator between God and man, and is, in the faithful discharge of the duties of his office, glorifying the Father, may be said to be God's, without the least implication of original inferiority. A.

From the Christian Observer.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH, UNDER THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

PART III.

The appropriation of one day in seven to the worship of God and other religious exercises, having been made a branch of the moral law as summed up in the Ten Commandments, and that law being confessedly, with respect to nine of the commandments, of universal and perpetual obligation; nothing more is needful to prove the authority of the fourth commandment, under the Gospel Dispensation, than to show that it has not been abrogated in the New Testament.

Our blessed Saviour in his sermon on the mount, hath assured us, in the most explicit terms, that it was not his design to abrogate any part of the moral law. —*Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.* Matt. v. 17, 18. He also denounced a curse upon any one, who, by his conduct and doctrine, should set aside the law.—*Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.* Matt. v. 19.

Our Saviour was undoubtedly speaking of the moral law, as contained in the Ten Commandments; for, immediately after these declarations he proceeded to expound the sixth, seventh and third commandments, as parts of that law of which he was discoursing, with a view to remove the false glosses which the Jews had put upon them, and to show their spiritual nature and their extent.

The perpetual obligation of the whole moral law cannot be expressed in stronger terms than those which our Saviour has used. If it had been his design to rescind a tenth part of the law, he surely would not have declared in this solemn manner, that not one jot

or tittle of it should be rescinded.

The same doctrine is taught by the Apostle Paul in Romans, iii. 31.—*Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: Yea, we establish the law.* But an important branch of the law is made void through faith, if the gospel annuls the obligation of the fourth commandment.

Let us then weigh the import of those passages in the New Testament which have been thought by some to imply an abrogation of the fourth commandment; and consider whether they are capable of a sound interpretation which is consistent with these plain declarations of our Redeemer and his Apostle.

An opinion has been adopted, that the appointment of the first day of the week for the publick religious exercises of Christians, is a tacit abrogation of the fourth commandment which appoints, the seventh day for the celebration of the Sabbath. But it is obvious that this change is merely circumstantial, and does not interfere with the essence of the command. The last day of the week was undoubtedly appropriated by the fourth commandment; but it is remarkable, that the words may be applied to any day in the seven. We are enjoined to pursue our ordinary labours during six days, and on every seventh day to rest. This injunction is fulfilled, whatever day of the seven be the day of rest.

The reason given in this commandment for the observance of the institution is, that it pleased God to occupy six days in the creation of heaven and earth, and to rest from his work on the seventh day. Our regards are not diverted from a due consideration of God's love in creating us, by the alteration of the day appointed to the Sabbath; though we are thereby directed to the celebration of a blessing superior to that of creation.

It is worthy of observation, that during the Jewish Dispensation, another act of love on the part of our gracious Creator, is mentioned as the reason for observing a sabbatical rest.—*Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm. Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Deut. v. 15. Hence we see, that the motive for observing one day in seven, as a Sabbath to the Lord, may be changed, without any change in the commandment.

Our Saviour seems to have alluded to a future change in the day of the week, to be appropriated to the Christian Sabbath, when he declared that he was *Lord of the Sabbath.* Mark, ii. 28. A consideration of the context will show, that this is the most natural interpretation of his words. He had been vindicating the conduct of his disciples, who, to satisfy their hunger, had plucked the ears of corn and eat them, as they went through the corn fields on the Sabbath-day, and had been showing that works of necessity and mercy were proper on the Sabbath. On this occasion he declared, *that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,* ver. 27, and then added—*Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* The exercise of Christ's authority over the Sabbath, was a consequence resulting from the former declaration, that *the Sabbath was made for man.* Now if he designed to

inform us that the Sabbath would be abolished, the premises and conclusion are by no means coincident. The words of our Lord must then have this import: "The Sabbath was a gracious institution, designed for the benefit of man, therefore I will take away this benefit from him." Whereas, if we suppose that these words had respect to the celebration of our redemption, a mercy greatly superior to that of creation, or the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the whole sentence is beautifully connected and of gracious import. It is as if our Lord had said, "Since the institution of the Sabbath was designed as a favor to man, and has hitherto directed his attention to the celebration of that love and power which created the heavens and the earth; and has also reminded the chosen nation of their deliverance from the most oppressive bondage; I will so regulate the day as to direct the attention of my disciples to the greatest of all mercies,—the completion of my labours for their eternal redemption."

I am aware that a third sense may be put upon these words of our Saviour. They may be understood as expressive of a design to soften, (according to the ideas of some,) the rigours of the sabbatical institution. But I hope I have sufficiently shown, that our Lord introduced no new doctrine respecting the Sabbath, when he declared that works of necessity and mercy were consistent with the sanctification of that day, and that he did not in any other respect alter the law of that institution as delivered by Moses and the Prophets.* Indeed, the relaxation of the fourth, or any other commandment, would prove a curse instead of a blessing to mankind. *For the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good.* Romans, vii. 12. If it had been the design of our Lord to abolish, under the Christian Dispensation, the institution of a Sabbath, I do not see how he could have spoken of it in terms of respect in relation to an event which he knew would not happen until forty years after the commencement of that dispensation.

But when he was privately giving his disciples an account of the dreadful calamities which would take place at the siege of Jerusalem, he directed them to pray, that their *flight might not be on the Sabbath-day.* Matt. xxiv. 20, since in that case, they must either have been inattentive to the peculiar duties of the day, through the multiplicity of worldly concerns which would then press upon them, or have neglected their own safety through fear of breaking the commandment.

The principal passages in the New Testament, which, at first sight, seem to favour the idea of the abolition of the Sabbath, under the Gospel Dispensation, occur, 1st, in Rom. xiv. 5. *One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* And 2d, that in Colossians, ii. 16. *Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days.* But if the sense of these passages be determined by the context, it will appear that they were written with a reference to the ceremonial law, which was designed to be abolished by the Gospel Dispensation; and that they are

* See Thoughts on the Sabbath during the Jewish Dispensation.—Christian Magazine, Vol. II, page 344.

not contrary to the idea of a Christian Sabbath.

In order to a right understanding of these passages, it is necessary to remember, that the Gospel Dispensation did not supersede the Jewish by a sudden transition, and immediately render the Jewish observances unlawful to all who received Christ as their Saviour. It was the design of God, that a gradual change should take place; so that, on the one hand, no violence should be done to the consciences of those, who had been educated in the observance of the ceremonial law; and on the other, that the Gentile believers should not be brought under the yoke of the Jewish ritual. The Apostles themselves, if we may judge, by the conduct of Peter, were not fully informed at the day of Pentecost, of the intended abolition of the ceremonial law; for he conceived himself bound by the Jewish doctrine of clean and unclean meats, when he was invited to go and preach the Gospel to Cornelius, who was a Gentile; though afterwards we find Peter declaring in the first Christian synods that the ceremonial law was a *yoke, which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear.* Acts, xv. 10. St. Paul, indeed, seems to have had a full display made to him at once of the whole system of the Gospel; yet he continually taught the lawfulness of Jewish observances to those who had been educated as Jews, and himself conformed to them upon all proper occasions.

Many contentions must have arisen during this state of things, amongst the Christian converts, respecting the authority of the Jewish ritual; and to such contentions, the Apostle is evidently referring in the passages above cited.—*Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things; another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not, and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth. One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike.* If we understand this last clause as relating to the institution of the ceremonial law, it will then be agreeable to the scope of the context, and will contradict no other part of the New Testament, but if we conceive of it as intended to cast a slight on the Christian Sabbath, we shall then set it in direct opposition to the declarations of our Saviour, as well as to the doctrines and conduct of the Apostles. They acted, no doubt, by the divine direction, in appointing the first day of the week, instead of the last, to be the day on which Christians should hold their publick assemblies for religious worship, on which they should break bread in remembrance of Christ's death; and on which publick collections should be made for the benefit of their distressed brethren. To this day they gave the venerable title, THE LORD'S DAY, a title which has been handed down in the Christian Church through every succeeding age, as appropriated to the Christian *Sabbath.*

The same reasoning is applicable, to the passages which I have quoted from the Epistle to the Colossians. It is evident from the context, that the Apostle was speaking of the ordinances of the ceremonial law, for the neglect of which no Christian was to be condemned. *Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances, that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nail-*

ing it to his cross. Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days. Colossians, ii. 14, 16. In this passage the Apostle is clearly speaking of *burdensome* ordinances; of something that was *against* them, and contrary to the spirituality of the Gospel. But can any pious person conceive, that the spending of one day in seven in spiritual services, in the delightful employment of social worship, and other religious exercises, could be ranked by the holy Apostle amongst the things which were against Christianity, and contrary to it? Was that institution, which the people of God had been commanded to call *a delight, holy of the Lord and honorable*, now to be esteemed of so carnal a nature as to be ranked amongst the things, which Christ *took out of the way, nailing it to his cross?* Were those holy persons, who had been accustomed to adopt the language of the Psalmist, *I was glad when they said unto me, let us go up to the house of the Lord*, now taught to esteem a day spent in such services, as a part of that *yoke, which neither the Apostles nor their fathers were able to bear?* We must destroy all just ideas of the effects, which the preaching of the Gospel was intended to produce, before we can adopt such an interpretation of the Apostle's words. Whereas, if we suppose him to mean, that no Christian ought to be condemned who had relinquished the Jewish ritual, and joined in transferring the sabbatical institution from the seventh to the first day of the week, in honour of the resurrection of our Redeemer, the passage becomes void of difficulty, or contradiction to other passages of the New Testament.

No farther arguments, I trust, are necessary to show the nature and obligation of the Christian Sabbath; but I cannot dismiss this part of my subject without mentioning one reflection, which has often forcibly impressed my own mind.

It is acknowledged on all hands, that Christians are favoured with a clearer knowledge of the divine will than had been vouchsafed to mankind before the coming of Christ; that the motives to love and serve God are increased under the Gospel Dispensation; and that a more abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit has been granted since the glorification of Christ.

It might, therefore, be reasonably expected, that the character of pious Christians should be somewhat superior to that of pious Jews; that the clearer views of the love and mercy of God in our redemption, and of our infinite obligations to our Redeemer, should produce greater delight in those holy exercises which are so well calculated to call forth our gratitude and excite our love. Yet if a sabbatical institution, as described by the prophet Isaiah, is not binding upon Christians as it was upon the Jews, this comparison must be reversed; and the employments of the Sabbath must have been more spiritual under the Jewish than under the Christian Dispensation.

I see the pious Jew abstracting himself every seventh day from the cares and concerns of this life, joining in the ordinances of worship with a *delight*, which would render every other employment on that day insipid; and directing his *pleasures* and *conversation* in conformity to the peculiar duties of that holy season. Whereas, the pious Christian (if the observance of the Sabbath is

not a breach of Christianity) must fall short of the pious Jew in the spiritual frame of his mind on that day; and as far as the exercises of that day have influence, in the general spirituality of his disposition. The Christian will not, indeed, neglect the publick services of religion, which the laws and customs of his country may have appointed for the day; but then, *one will go to his farm, and another to his merchandize;* or, at least, his thoughts and conversation will be engaged by these subjects, or his time spent in some unprofitable amusement, unless he performs what he must conceive to be a work of supererogation.

Every one, however, who has made the trial, must be sensible of the advantage which his mind derives from the employment of himself in religious exercises, of one kind or other, during the whole of the Sabbath-day. The influence of such conduct on the temper of our minds, during the remainder of the week, is not small. On the contrary, a total neglect of the peculiar duties of the day, seems, from experience, to be inconsistent with a state of religion. How forcibly do these considerations point out the value of this institution, and show, that we ought to regard as a favour, the permission to spend one day in seven as a *Sabbath to the Lord*, even if this had not been made a subject of command! W. H.

[To be continued.]

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER VI.

Then said the Interpreter, I will show you one thing more. So he took them to a prison, and showed them a prisoner who had been sentenced to solitary confinement at hard labour for a certain time, which was specified in the law, which time had now expired. And as the keeper of the prison came to the door, the prisoner called to him, and said, my time is out—I have suffered all the punishment which the law required—I demand my discharge. So the keeper unlocked the door, and set him at liberty.

Then said the pilgrims, what means this.

In. Do you understand the ground on which this man was discharged? Was it on the ground of justice, or on the ground of mercy?

Th. I think I understand it. It was on the ground that he had suffered all the punishment which the law required. He was discharged on the ground of justice. I see no mercy in the case.

In. Did he ask his discharge of the keeper as a favour, or thank the keeper for granting it?

Th. No; he demanded it as his right. He gave no thanks.

In. Could the keeper have retained him any longer without being guilty of injustice?

Th. No; for having suffered all that the law required, if the keeper had retained him longer, it would have been the same as punishing one who had committed no offence.

In. The infliction of suffering upon one who has committed no offence would not be a true and proper punishment. It would be an act of oppression, however, to have detained the prisoner any longer against his will. But did the keeper say any thing about pardon?

Th. No; there was no pardon in the case.

In. No; there was not. Pardon, or forgiveness, is the remission of a punishment which the law has denounced. But where that punishment is fully inflicted, there is nothing remitted; and of course there is no pardon or forgiveness in the case.

Th. What is the application of this?

In. It shows the absurdity of what some teach; that men suffer all the punishment their sins deserve, either before or after death; and yet are pardoned, forgiven, or made the subjects of mercy. If any suffer the whole of the punishment which the law denounces for their sins, they are not saved by Christ—they are not subjects of mercy—they have nothing forgiven them—they are not treated with grace—they have no occasion to ask for their discharge as a favour—they may demand it as their right—their discharge is an act of justice—they have no thanks to give for it.

This transaction also shows the absurdity of what some teach; that the sins of men were punished in the person of Christ, and yet are forgiven. The same sin cannot be both fully punished, and freely pardoned or forgiven. Forgiveness is the remission of that punishment which might justly be inflicted. But a crime cannot be justly punished twice over. Therefore, if the sins of men had been punished in the person of Christ, they could not be justly punished again in them; and consequently, they must be discharged on the ground of justice. They might be under great obligations to him for suffering their punishment for them, and to the Father for giving his son to do this; but they could be under no obligations to him for their discharge itself, after this was done. Their discharge could not be an act of grace—it could not be a pardon—it could not with propriety be asked as a favour, but challenged as a right—and no thanks need be rendered for merely granting what is justly due.

Th. If the death of Christ was not a punishment of the sins of men, how does it have any efficacy in procuring their discharge?

In. It is an expedient, devised by infinite wisdom to answer the end of punishment, without the actual infliction of that punishment, so that mercy may be exercised in remitting that punishment by a true and proper forgiveness.

Th. How does it answer that end?

In. When Christ voluntarily submitted to die on the cross for sinners, he thereby magnified the law and made it honorable; inasmuch as his death shows the evil of sin, and how God feels towards it, in as clear a light, (considering the dignity of his person,) as the execution of the penalty of the law upon the sinner could have shown it. It thus answers the end of punishment, and opens a door of mercy to a perishing world.

Then I perceived that the Interpreter bid the pilgrims remember the things they had seen and heard. So he gave them refreshments, and lodged them all night; and in the morning, he questioned them in many words, out of the King's book, and further instructed them in his statutes, that they might know their Master's will, and do it, and be found faithful unto the end. So he dismissed them to go on their way, after having given them a caution to beware of the arts of three sisters, *Hypocrisy*, *Carnal*

Policy, and *Heresy*, with whom he told them they would be likely to meet in some part of their journey. So they gave him many thanks for his instructions and counsels, and departed.

Now I perceived that they had not gone far from the Interpreter's house, before they saw a stile over the wall, on the right hand, on which was inscribed, "THE HYPOCRITE'S HOPE." And while they stood looking, behold three men came along to that stile, and came over the wall by it into the King's highway, of whom Thoughtful and Ardent had some knowledge in the city of Destruction, and whose names were *Feel-well*, *Love-self*, and *No-law*. Then Feel-well came forward to shake them by the hand, and said,

F. w. How do you do, neighbours? you are going on pilgrimage I see. And so am I. I rejoice to meet you. The pilgrim's life is a happy one. I *know* it is. I wish the whole world would only try it.

Th. I believe that pilgrims have their comforts, and their sorrows; and both peculiar to themselves.

F. w. That they have their comforts, I *know*. But that is too cold a word, they have their joys. But that pilgrims should have any sorrows, I do not understand. If they do, it must be because they have so little faith.

Th. I am sensible that if I had more faith in God, more true confidence in him, and were more willing to be at his entire disposal, I should have less trouble of mind. But when I have the clearest views of God, I have also the clearest discovery of my own vileness; and that fills me with the deepest sorrow for my sins. I loathe and abhor myself, and grieve that I have dishonoured my Lord and King.

F. w. I perceive that you do not understand me. I mean by faith, the belief that *my* sins are pardoned, and that *I* shall be received at the gate of the Celestial City. I *know* this by my own feelings. And therefore I am full of joy.

Th. You seem to be very confident that you shall be received at the Celestial gate. But I am afraid you will be disappointed; for I perceive you did not come in by the door, but climbed up some other way. You have come over the stile of the hypocrite's hope; and I apprehend your end will be according to your beginning.

F. w. If we are in the way, we are in it; and it matters not how we came in. I therefore cordially embrace you as a brother pilgrim, though you feel so uncharitable towards me. But I doubt not that the way we came is as good, if not better than yours. I am certain it was much more agreeable. For, though we heard Evangelist as well as you, we did not like his preaching, and we could not bear his directions. And if we had heard no other, we should never have been persuaded to set out on pilgrimage. But we chose to hear every one that we could. I liked Doctor Smoothman pretty well; but he had not zeal enough. I did not like Doctor Soothing, because he would have me wait the King's time, and I was for doing something at once. I did not like Mr. Save-all, because he would have us all stay in the city till it was burned, and then go by a short way to the Celestial country, in a chariot of fire. I did not like the mode of conveyance. But I disliked Evangelist more than all the rest; and I have no doubt that he hin-

ders more from going on pilgrimage, than even Mr. Save-all himself. But I liked the man they nick-name Mr. *Blind-guide*, but whose true name he told me, is *Guide-to-the-blind*. He pleased me exactly. He told me of this *way into the way*, by which we have come. And he furnished us with a conductor called *Repentance*, who accompanied us as long as we had need of him, even to the house of Mr. *Self-confidence*, in the village of *Peace-in-believing*, which we entered by the gate of *Experience*, and where we lodged one night, and saw glorious things. From that place to this stile, over which we have come, the way has been smooth and pleasant.

Here Ardent sighed deeply, and shook his head. Then Feel-well said to him;

F. w. What is the matter, brother Ardent?

Ard. I remember Mr. Blind-guide, to my sorrow. I disliked Evangelist's instructions at first, as you did, and went to Mr. Blind-guide for directions. He sent me, as he did you, to the village of False-peace, where I abode with Mr. Self-confidence a considerable time, and having returned to our city, I was well nigh lost forever.

F. w. Aye, true indeed. You fell away: you turned back. Had you only kept on as I have, all had been well. Hold on, and hold out, is my maxim; and that I am determined to do, till I reach the Celestial City, and shout hosannas to the King of Glory.

Love-self. If I only get through at last, I shall be satisfied; though I confess I have not always the same confidence of it that brother Feel-well has. I have my doubts occasionally, which make me very unhappy while they last. But I feel better since I have got over this stile, and find myself safe in the King's Highway.

No-law. I have no doubts, and never have had, since we got to the village of Peace-in-believing. It was there revealed to me in a dream, the night we lodged with Mr. Self-confidence, that the Prince Immanuel had taken all my sins, and given me all his righteousness. If I step occasionally out of the way, it never troubles me any, since I know that the Prince Immanuel bore the punishment of it all.

By this time, I perceived that the company drew near to the cross, and had a view of Him who bled thereon. And I thought they all appeared to be more or less moved at the sight, but expressed their feelings in different ways. Feel-well jumped up and down, and clapped his hands, and shouted aloud. Love-self sat down and contemplated the sight with a cheerful countenance. No-law stood and looked attentively, but without much emotion. Ardent wept aloud; and Thoughtful stood apart, looking intensely at the cross, with a countenance of deep solemnity, while a few tears trickled down his cheeks.

Oh, (said Feel-well,) how can I express my joy at this sight? It fills my soul with ecstacy. I see here the assurance of my acceptance at the Celestial gate. There hangs the man who died for me. How can I help loving him for his great love to me; let those hold their peace who cannot feel. I want a religion that I can *feel*. And I thank the King that I *do* feel his love shed abroad in my heart. Glory to the King! Glory to the Prince who died for me! Glory! Glory!

Now, (said Love-self,) I see my title clear, I see my sins re-

moved. He bore them all for me. By his obedience to the law in my room, I am justified and accepted. I will doubt no more.

Here, (said No-law,) I see how unnecessary are good works. The finished righteousness of the Prince Immanuel does not need any additions of ours. I read that he justifies the ungodly; and I come to be justified as ungodly. I make no pretences to any righteousness of my own.

I see here, (said Ardent,) the effect of my sins. They pierced the hands and feet of the Prince of Life. They inflicted those cruel wounds which seem to bleed afresh, as I look upon them. In view of this scene, how vile and hateful my sins appear! Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes were fountains of tears, that I might weep day and night for my base ingratitude. How vile I am! How loathsome I appear to myself!

Here, (said Thoughtful,) appears the great evil of sin. It occasioned the death of the King of Glory. Here I see the great love of God to a sinful world, in giving his only begotten Son to die for them. Here I see the infinite condescention of the Prince Immanuel, who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we, through his poverty, might be rich. Here I see God's regard for his law, the honour of which was maintained at such an expense. From this scene, we may draw motives for a holy life; for how shall we who are dead to sin, by the cross, live any longer therein. BUNYANUS.

INSPIRATION.

If we should suppose that it were as uncommon for men to *see*, as it is to be born blind; would not the few who had this rare gift appear as prophets and inspired teachers to the many? We conceive inspiration to give a man no new faculty, but to communicate to him in a new way and by extraordinary means, what the faculties common to mankind can apprehend, and what he can communicate to others by ordinary means. On the supposition we have made, sight would appear to the blind very similar to this; for the few who had this gift would communicate the knowledge acquired by it to those who had it not. They could not, indeed, convey to the blind any distinct notion of the manner in which they acquired this knowledge. A ball and socket would seem to a blind man, in this case, as improper an instrument for acquiring such a variety and extent of knowledge, as a dream or a vision. The manner in which a man who sees, discerns so many things by means of the eye, is as unintelligible to the blind, as the manner in which a man may be inspired with knowledge by the Almighty, is to us. Ought the blind man, therefore, without examination, to treat all pretences to the gift of seeing, as imposture? Might he not, if he were candid and tractable, find reasonable evidence of the reality of this gift in others, and draw great advantages from it to himself?

Reid.

ANECDOTE.

The late Rev. WILLIAM ROMAINE, of London, in crossing the Black Friar's bridge, came up with a man who, in a style of unusual and fearful impiety, called upon God "*to damn his soul for* CHRIST'S *sake!*" Mr. Romaine,

laying his hand upon the blasphemer's shoulder, said; "*My friend, God has done many things for Christ's sake, and perhaps he will do* THAT *too;*" and passed on. The reproof, quite as original as the imprecation, went to the wretch's heart; and was the occasion of his "turning from the power of Satan unto God," and becoming an exemplary follower of that Redeemer whom he had been in the habit of insulting. "A word spoken in due season, how good is it?" The power of JESUS to save, how mighty! His grace, how free!

A STRANGE SIGHT.

It is indeed a strange sight to see those who complain they can do nothing without Christ, labouring hard, and those who boast they can do great things, standing idle,—to see those who renounce all dependence upon their good works, abounding in good works; and those who expect to be saved by their good works, living in neglect of good works, and doing the works of the Devil. *Davies.*

From the Christian's Magazine.

ANECDOTE OF DR. D——,

Illustrative of the difference between a speculative and practical knowledge of the truths of the gospel.

With the most splendid talents and highest improvements, *the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* Whatever difficulties may arise in drawing a discriminating line between the rational powers of the mind, in its ordinary exercises, and those which relate to God and the spiritual life, it is very certain there is an essential difference between them. The express declarations of scripture establish this difference, and it is daily confirmed by observation. Learned men are not always pious. Nay, among those who have advanced far in science, and acquired great reputation for their extensive researches, and vast erudition, are often found the most implacable enemies to both natural and revealed religion. With all their knowledge, they are ignorant of the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal. They have not discovered the spirituality of the divine law, its principle, and extent; nor understood the scope of the gospel, the duties it enjoins, and the blessings it reveals. Those who have been effectually called out of darkness, and by renewing and irresistible grace, brought into marvellous light, are conscious of this difference and willing to acknowledge it. But as the greatest number of these were, previously to their conversion, uninstructed in the doctrines of salvation, and had, perhaps, never read the sacred scriptures with attention, the comparative estimate of their former knowledge cannot, by themselves or others, be accurately ascertained. A very singular instance, which illustrates the difference between speculative and practical knowledge, and which is worth preserving, is sent for that purpose to be inserted in the Christian's Magazine.

Dr. D—— was a man of strong mind and extensive reading; of an amiable disposition and polished manners. He had nearly finished his course of studies in the university of Groningen, and had obtained the degree of Doctor of

Philosophy, a grade in literary honours conferred by some universities on the continent of Europe. He had published a Treatise in Latin, *de Systemate Leibnitiano, de vera miraculi Notione, et de speciali Dei Providentia*, which established his reputation as a scholar of the first rank. As he had devoted himself to the study of theology, he left Groningen in the year 1767, and came to Utrecht, where the most celebrated professor in theology, at that time drew students to attend his lectures from every quarter. Dr. D—— professed a deep reverence for the Christian religion. He had studied the doctrines, was thoroughly learned in the arguments by which they are maintained and defended, and had determined soon to enter into the ministry. But with all his learning and decent profession, he was a stranger to the saving influence of divine grace; and had never experienced the converting power of the truth upon his own heart. He was satisfied with a speculative knowledge, and supposed that nothing more was necessary to fit him for the ministry, or render him safe as it respected his own peace and happiness.

A friend, who was in habits of intimacy with him, calling one morning to see him, observed a pensive air, and an unusual seriousness mixed with distress in his countenance, which prompted an immediate inquiry respecting the cause of his disquietude. Without the least reserve, he communicated the state of his mind, and the occasion which had produced it.

The preceding evening he had received a letter, which informed him of the death of an excellent man, the Rev. Dr. N——, whom he greatly loved, and with whom he had lived in the strictest bonds of friendship from early youth. Oppressed with grief, he first felt the pangs which such an event is calculated to excite. But the sensibility of nature soon gave place to other reflections, and aroused anxieties and feelings of a different kind. The death of his friend introduced his own death to view. He realized the possibility of being also cut down suddenly in the prime of life. Eternity, with all its solemn importance and consequences, impressed his soul: then, for the first time in his life, he was convinced of his misery. He then saw and felt that he was a guilty, depraved sinner, that he had no resources in himself, no righteousness of his own. Alarmed and distressed, he had passed the night with conflicting passions, and sought consolation in vain from all he knew of the gospel. He had now become as calm as, under such impressions it is perhaps possible to be, and appeared sincerely desirous of instruction. "Tell me," said he, with great eagerness, "tell me where and how a wounded and accusing conscience can find peace? What must I do to be saved?" After some observations which were judged applicable to his present exercises, his friend referred him to the precious atonement of the divine Redeemer, and the imputation of his perfect righteousness,* by which the greatest of sinners who believe in Jesus, are justified. But of this, added his friend, you need no information; you are intimately acquainted with the doctrines of the gospel. "It is true," he replied, "it is true, I am acquainted with those doc-

* We believe that the sinner is justified by the atonement of Christ. But that the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed to the sinner, we do not believe.—*Editors.*

trines. I have studied them, I understand them individually, and in their connexion, and can explain them to others, and defend them against adversaries. But my knowledge is merely speculative, I have only viewed them in theory as perfect and divine; but never applied them to myself. I know not how to repent, or how to believe. I know no more how to approach a throne of grace as a condemned sinner, or with what exercises and in what way to come to Jesus, than the most ignorant creature on earth. "Sit down," added he, "and instruct me."

An instance so striking and pointed seldom occurs, where a man of great learning and information, even in the truths of religion, was laid as low at the footstool of sovereign grace, as the most ignorant sinner; and where the difference between speculative and experimental knowledge is so clearly displayed.—It need only be added, it pleased the Lord to direct his humble convert, and bring him through faith in Christ, to joy and peace in believing. He became sometime afterwards a Minister, was settled in the church, and as highly respected for his piety and usefulness, as he was before for his erudition. He is probably still living, and bearing testimony from his own experience, to the necessity of a new heart, and the teaching of the Holy Spirit to salvation.

The writer of this anecdote is himself the friend alluded to above. He has a perfect recollection of the affecting interview, and can vouch for the truth of this little narrative.

Religious Intelligence.

The unfavourable changes which have recently taken place in the Russian policy, have been such as to palsy in a great measure, the efforts of the Russian Bible Society, and to cause the suspension of all the Scotch Missions in Russia, except the station at Karass.—The Bible Society, which for several years, pursued so distinguished a course, and promised to supply with the word of life, not only the Russian population, but the numerous Heathen and Mahomedan tribes of that wide extended empire, is now completely paralyzed in its exertions, and appears to be dying a lingering death. In consequence of the powerful opposition which was raised to the Bible Society, Prince Galatzin, its noble President, retired from that office; he, at the same time, resigned his situation as minister of religion, and a Russian Admiral was appointed in his place. Its no less excellent Secretary, Mr. Papoff, who visited this country about two years ago, and who was connected with the censorship of the press, was afterward put on his trial by the Criminal Court, respecting a book which had been published by Pastor Gossner, in which there were some reflections which were considered as somewhat unfavourable to the doctrine of the Greek Church relative to the Virgin Mary. Several others

were also involved in the same prosecution, two of them pious men. Pastor Gossner himself, who, though a Catholick, is said to be a most eloquent, evangelical, and useful preacher, had, previously to this, been ordered away from Petersburg on a few days notice. The powers of darkness, in short, appear to be mustering their forces in the Russian empire: the measures pursued seem to be a part of that general system for arresting the progress of light, and for involving the nations in all the darkness of the middle ages, which has of late years constituted the distinguishing characteristic of the policy of most of the Continental princes.

Boston Rec. & Tel.

THE MISSIONARIES IN BURMAH SAFE.

It is now a long time since our churches have been held in painful suspense with respect to the fate of the Rev. Dr. Judson and his wife, Missionaries at Ava, in the kingdom of Burmah. This suspense is now happily ended by a letter from Edward A. Newton, Esq. of Calcutta, to Mr. Evarts, the Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Missions. It is dated Calcutta, May 23, 1825, and is as follows:

My Dear Sir,—It gives me infinite pleasure to acquaint you, that Mr. and Mrs. Judson are alive and well. Accounts have this day been received of them. They have been liberated and sent with other European prisoners to treat with the British Commander for peace. Peace will undoubtedly be made immediately, and all be well. I request you to give all possible publicity to this communication, as the Christian world is deeply interested in the fate of these respected persons.

E. A. Newton.

Mis. Her.

PROPOSED UNION.

We learn from various parts of the country that the contemplated union between the United Foreign Missionary Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, is hailed as a most auspicious event by the friends of both institutions. On no subject within our recollection has there been more perfect unanimity. From the North and the South, and beyond the Alleganies, the same voice of firm and decided approbation, is heard. Let all, who feel for the spiritual wants of mankind, make this an occasion for more fervent prayer for a blessing upon Missionary labours and of more active efforts to awaken our great community to the present inviting condition of many countries now stretching out their hands for the Gospel. *Ib.*

BIBLE SOCIETY.

A Society was organized in the court-house at Indianopolis, (Ind.) the 25th of Nov. 1825, entitled "The Auxiliary Bible Society for Marion Co. Indiana.

The New-York religious papers state, that the premium of fifty dollars, offered some time since for the best Tract "On the duty of professors of religion, and especially those who have wealth, to consecrate their property to the spread of the Gospel," has been awarded to the Rev. Daniel A. Clark, of Amherst, Mass. There were no less than 46 competitors.

Dedication.

Dec. 1,—A new and commodious Edifice was dedicated to the worship and service of God in the East Parish in Attleborough. The reading of a select portion of the Scriptures and introductory prayer by Rev. James Barney of Seekonk; the dedicatory prayer by Rev. Elisha Fisk of Wrentham; sermon by Rev. John Furgerson; concluding prayer by Rev. John Wilder. The Music was well chosen, and performed in a manner highly to interest and gratify the numerous and respectable audience. The Sermon by the Pastor was very appropriate to the occasion, and indicated a strong and original mind, cultivated by study, and enriched with Theological acquisitions. The building itself and the unanimity with which it was erected and completed, do great honour to the people in that place. The cordiality which subsists between the Pastor and the Church and Society, promises peace and prosperity to that part of Zion.

Ordinations and Installations.

March 5,—Rev. Mr. Brush was ordained Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Indianopolis, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. John F. Crow.

April 13,—Rev. Baynard R. Hall was ordained Pastor of the Church in Bloomington, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. Isaac Reed.

June 4,—Rev. Alexander Williamson was ordained as an Evangelist, in Charlestown, Indiana.

June 4,—Rev. Tilly H. Brown was ordained Pastor of the United Churches of Bethlehem and Blue River, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. Isaac Reed.

August,—Rev. Stephen Bliss was ordained at Vincennes, Indiana, to the work of the Ministry. At the same time, Rev. Mr. Scott was installed Pastor of the Church at Indiana.

November,—Rev. Henry H. F. Sweet was ordained Pastor of the Church in Palmer. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Ide.

December 27,—Rev. Stephen M. Wheelock was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Warren, Vt.; and on the same occasion, Rev. George Freeman was ordained to the work of an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Chandler of Waitesfield.

December 28,—Rev. James D. Knowles was ordained Pastor of the 2d Baptist Church in Boston. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Chase, of the Theolog. Institution, Newton.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. is received and will be duly noticed.

We are obliged to our Correspondents who have enriched our pages with their valuable productions, and we sincerely hope that they will still favour us and the publick with their communications, and that others will contribute to our work from their Theological treasures.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. FEBRUARY, 1826. No. 2.

For the Christian Magazine.

ON DIVINATION.

THE inhabitants of New-England have been stigmatized for their superstition and credulity in respect to divination. But it ought to be known and remembered, that they were led into this delusion, by the opinion and practice of some of the most eminent civilians and divines in Britain. Divination, in various forms, prevailed *there*, before it prevailed *here;* and more persons were tried, condemned, and put to death for it *there*, than were ever tried, and punished for it *here*. It ill becomes Old-England to reproach New-England for following their own example. Both they and we undoubtedly acted without that coolness and deliberation, which was proper in a case so interesting to the characters and lives of men. The proper time, therefore, in which to form our opinions upon this subject, is when there is no appearance of the crime, and the characters and lives of men are not in jeopardy. And since such is the present time, it may not be deemed altogether improper or useless, to discuss the subject of divination and endeavour to gain all the light we can concerning it, by means of time, observation, scripture, and reason. In order to treat it with propriety and perspicuity, I shall consider the origin, the nature, and the evil, of Divination.

1. The origin of Divination.

This practice is of great antiquity. It prevailed soon after the destruction of the old world. As soon as mankind were dispersed by the confusion of languages, it spread among the principal nations of the earth. It was early practised in Chaldea and Babylon and Egypt, where we find magicians and astrologers; and among the Canaanites we find Balaam, who used divination and enchantments against Israel. This evil practice originated from a religious source. The true religion was revealed before any false religion existed, and all false religion is but a corruption of the true. Immediately after the apostacy of Adam, God appointed religious rites and ceremonies, which all the pious patriarchs observed, and handed down from generation to generation, by *tradition* and *example* only, until a written revelation was given by the hand of Moses. But both these modes of maintaining and spreading religion in the world could be easily and early corrupted. Accordingly we find this was the truth of fact. The heathen nations liked not to retain God in their knowledge; but soon forsook his religious ordinances, and followed their own evil imagina-

tions and inventions. They either totally neglected, or varied, or disfigured the religious rites, which had been conveyed to them by the example and tradition of their pious progenitors. So that all their false religions, and rites, and ceremonies, were but corruptions and perversions of the true. But notwithstanding the general declension and corruption of religion after the flood, God had some sincere friends and faithful servants, with whom he meant to hold a friendly intercourse; and appointed certain means or modes of their seeking and obtaining the knowledge of his mind and will, respecting not only their duty, but *future events*. As soon, however, as God called Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, and entered into covenant with him, and engaged to be his God and the God of his seed, he gave up the heathens to walk in their own ways, and confined his friendly intercourse to Abraham and his family until the law given by Moses. The heathen were now in a deplorable situation; for the true God had forsaken them, and they could not *themselves* look into futurity, and discover what changes and events would take place in time to come. Their curiosity and anxiety to know futurity, led them to the practice of *Divination*, or the use of certain modes and ceremonies of consulting their false divinities. They resolved to discover the unrevealed purposes of the true God, by some means or other; and if they could not discover future events by lawful means, they resolved to employ unlawful means; and if one method would not answer, they determined to try another, and another, until they were satisfied that they had gained their point. They knew that the seed of Abraham had obtained the knowledge of the mind and will of their God, by various rites and ceremonies, and they determined to obtain the knowledge of the mind and will of their gods, by some such, or different rites and ceremonies. From this religious source, it is pretty evident, originated divination in all its various, foolish, and pernicious forms. An undue curiosity to know futurity, led mankind to use undue methods to discover it.

2. The nature of Divination.

There is no need of being a magician, or diviner, in order to discover this mystery of iniquity. The Bible, I am persuaded, will give us a true and clear knowledge of the nature of divination. This practice, we have just observed, probably took its rise from those divinely instituted modes, by which God allowed good men to converse with him, and learn his mind and will. Divination, therefore, consisted in doing something, which more or less resembled the *modes*, by which good men inquired of God, and were enabled to foretell future events. We find these modes expressly mentioned in several instances. Jonathan was a good man, and in a certain critical situation, he wished to know the will of God respecting his duty, and he took the following method to obtain it. "It came to pass upon a certain day, that Jonathan the son of Saul said unto the young man that bare his armour, Come, and let us go over to the Philistines' garrison that is on the other side. But he told not his father. And Jonathan said unto the young man that bore his armour, Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that the

Lord will work for us: for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few. And his armour-bearer said unto him, Do all that is in thine heart: turn thee; behold, I am with thee according to thy heart. Then said Jonathan, Behold, we will pass over unto these men, and we will discover ourselves unto them. *If they say unto us, Tarry until we come to you;* then we will stand still in our place, and will not go go up unto them. *But if they say thus, Come up unto us;* then we will go up: *for the Lord hath delivered them into our hand:* and this shall be a *sign* unto us. And both of them discovered themselves unto the garrison of the Philistines: and the Philistines said, Behold the Hebrews come forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves. And the men of the garrison answered Jonathan and his armour-bearer, and said, *Come up to us,* and we will show you a thing. And Jonathan said unto his armour-bearer, *Come up after me; for the Lord hath delivered them into the hand of Israel.*" They went up and succeeded. Thus Jonathan made his own *signs,* by which he discovered the will of God in respect to his present duty. Gideon consulted God on a similar occasion, and discovered the will of God in the same way. "Gideon said unto God, If thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast said, Behold, I will put a fleece of wool in the floor; and if the dew be on the fleece only, and it be dry upon all the earth beside, *then shall I know that thou wilt save Israel by mine hand,* as thou hast said. *And it was so:* for he rose up early on the morrow, and thurst the fleece together, and wringed the dew out of the fleece, a bowl-full of water. And Gideon said unto God, Let not thine anger be hot against me, and I will speak but this once: let it now be dry only upon the fleece, and upon all the ground let there be dew. *And God did so that night:* for it was dry upon the fleece only, and there was dew on all the ground." Thus Gideon also made his own *signs,* and determined his duty according as God ordered those signs to happen. This, then, we are sure was one method, which God allowed his true friends and worshippers to take, in order to discover his will concerning duty and future events. Now, it is plain from Scripture, that divination consisted, in making certain arbitrary *signs,* in order to discover men's duty and fortune. And the different species of divination were only different signs to come at the same object. There was a great diversity of diviners and divinations forbidden by the law of Moses. "There shall not be found among you any one—that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer." After Moses had forbidden these species of divination, as abominations which the heathens had practised, he proceeded to promise a Prophet to Israel, who should reveal all that they could have occasion to know. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken." This seems to imply, that all kinds of divination were designed to discover things unknown and future; and that the various methods to reach this end, made all the difference between a diviner, a magician, an observer of times, an

enchanter, a witch, a charmer, a consulter with familiar spirits, a wizard, a necromancer, a soothsayer, or astrologer. All these sorts of persons were only diviners or fortune tellers, who used different signs to gain their pretended knowledge. They all made their own signs, or employed their own peculiar methods, to extort the knowledge of futurity from him whom they considered as the great and invisible disposer of events. Accordingly, all their signs were of the same nature; that is, the nature of a lot. All their signs referred the matter sought, to the knowledge and disposal of some invisible agent. This is the nature of a lot. Solomon says, "the lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord."

But that divination consisted in making *certain arbitrary signs*, in imitation of the mode which God allowed his friends to use, in order to learn his will, may clearly appear, if we only consider distinctly, some of the different modes of ancient divination. Let us begin with a diviner. Such was the king of Babylon. He used what was called the divination of the *staff* or *arrow*. We are told, "the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination: he made his arrows bright." The meaning seems to be this: Nebuchadnezzar came to a place where two ways met, one led to the city Rabbath, and the other to Jerusalem; and in order to determine which of these cities he should attack first, he had recourse to this method. He wrote the names of the two cities upon seval arrows, which were mixed together promiscuously in a quiver; and a boy, who was unacquainted with the matter, drew out one, and the name of Jerusalem being upon it, the king was determined to lead his army towards that city. Others suppose the manner of this consultation was thus: the consulter measured his staff by spans, or by the length of his finger; saying as he measured, I will go, I will not go; I will do such a thing, I will not do it; and as the last span fell out, so he determined. This construction seems to be referred to by the prophet Hosea, where he says, "My people ask counsel of the *stocks*, and their *staff* declareth unto them." In this mode of divination it appears, that the whole art consisted in making certain arbitrary *signs*, which referred the object sought, to the disposal of some invisible hand.

The king of Babylon used two other modes of divivation. It is said, "He made bright his arrows, he consulted *images*, he looked into the *liver*." These images are supposed to be the *Teraphim*, or the same as the old Romans' household gods. How he consulted these we have no account. But his divination by looking into the liver is easy to understand. "To divine by the entrails was a practice generally adopted among the heathens; and because the liver was the principal member inspected, it was called consultation with the liver. In this kind of divination there were chiefly observed the colour of the entrails, their place, whether none were displaced, and the number, whether none were wanting, and the want of the liver was always understood to presage the greatest misfortunes." This mode of divination wholly consisted in making arbitrary signs, and interpreting them in an arbitrary manner.

The Jews divined by Bath Kol. The mode was this. "The next words which they heard the next person speak that they met with, they called a voice from heaven, because thereby they thought the judgment of heaven to be declared, as to any dubious point, and the decrees of heaven to be revealed concerning the future success of any matter, which they wished to be informed of." This divination consisted in making and construing arbitrary signs. So did divination by books. Both Heathens and Christians practised this mode of divination; which was as follows. They opened a certain book, and the first words that turned up to view were the Oracle. The Christians used the Bible, for the same purpose, and in the same manner. Prideaux relates this anecdote. "On the consecration of William, the second Norman Bishop of the diocese of Norwich, the words which the Bible first opened at for him were *Nonhune, sed Barrabam*, that is, not this man, but Barrabas; by which they made a judgment that this Bishop was not long to continue, and that a thief should come in his place; and so it accordingly happened." This mode of divination has been practised by modern as well as by ancient Christians. The writer of the life Mr. Wesley, the Father of the Westleyan Methodists, says, that he not only once or twice, but habitually used this mode of divination, to discover his duty. He determined the great question, whether he should be a *Calvinist*, or an *Armenian*, by casting a lot. And he frequently determined his duty in doubtful cases, by the words at which his Bible first turned up to view. And a great many professors of religion, as well as others, have gone, and still go, into the same practice of divination by the Bible. In this way likewise some determine whether they have met with a saving change. If the first words they meet with, in opening the Bible happen to be these: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," they conclude it is a divine declaration of their good estate. Another way of divination was by birds. This may be illustrated by a story Hecateus tells us. "As I was travelling towards the Red Sea, there was in the company with us a certain Jew Mosollam, who excelled in archery. As several of us were travelling together, a certain sooth-sayer, who took upon him to fortel the fortune of our journey, bade all of us stand still, and we did so. Whereon this Jew asked us, what we stood for? Look ye, answered the cunning man, and showed him a bird. If that bird *stands*, said he, ye are to stand; *and if it rises and flies on*, ye are to go forward too; but if the bird *takes its flight the contrary way*, you must all go back again. The Jew hereat, without a word speaking, let fly an arrow, and killed the bird. This displeased the diviner and some of the company. Why certainly, said the Jew to them, are ye not all mad to make such a bustle about a foolish bird? How could that poor, wretched creature pretend to foreshow our fortune, that knew nothing of its own?" This divination consisted in arbitrary signs, arbitrarily construed. An observer of times divined in the same manner; he fixed on certain days or hours as fortunate, and on other certain days or hours as unfortunate; and pretended to foretell good or evil, by his own arbitrary signs. But it is needless to consider all the different modes of divination, if we

had time and knowledge sufficient. It appears from all the modes of divination which have been mentioned, that they are all of the same nature, and consist in making and interpreting arbitrary signs. And no diviner ever had power to do any more than this. Hence Cicero said, he wondered how any two soothsayers could look one another in the face, without smiling, because they knew each other to be impostors.

3. The evil of Divination.

That it is evil, God has assured us in his word. Diviners of every sort, are represented, both in the Old and New Testament, as vile and criminal characters, and severe punishments are denounced against them. Indeed, divination was a capital crime in Israel. None who practised this art were allowed to live, but expressly condemned to die. But why? Wherin did the criminality of divination consist? This is the question we are now to consider. And in considering it, we ought to make a distinction between the Jews and Heathens. Divination was less criminal in the latter, than in the former; but in both, altogether inexcusable. For,

1. It manifested too great a curiosity to know what God had a right to conceal. "Secret things, says Moses, belong unto the Lord our God; but those things that are revealed belong to us and to our children." Men have no right to pry into the secrets of divine providence. They ought not to be anxious about to-morrow; but ought to be entirely satisfied to know that their times are in the hands of God. But it is the design of divination to discover and defeat the counsels of heaven. It is, therefore, in its own nature a presumptuous tempting of providence. And in this its criminality partly consists. For were this all it implied, it would be criminal, and deserve the divine displeasure. And on this account it was very sinful in the heathens as well as Jews.

2. Divination had a tendency to lead men away from the path of duty, and to involve them in error and danger. By supposing they knew what they did not know, they were led to believe what they had no right to believe, and to do what they had no right to do. Divination, being an error, had a tendency to plunge them into other great and dangerous errors and delusions. And on this ground, it always was and always will be, extremely criminal. I must add,

3. That among the Jews, divination was not only disobedience to the divine law, but rebellion against the divine government. As a transgression of the law, it was disobedience; and as a withdrawment of their allegiance to the God of Israel, it was real rebellion. Hence it is said, that "rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," which implies that witchcraft is rebellion. Indeed, God expressly declared, that he viewed divination as a departure from him, and rebellion against him. Ahaziah was guilty of rebellion, in applying to divination to know whether his life should be preserved. He met with a fall and was sick in Samaria; "and he sent messengers, and said unto them, go, and inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover of this disease. But the angel of the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, Arise, go up to meet the messengers of the King of Samaria, and say unto them, Is it because there is not a God in Israel, that ye go

to inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron?" The language of Ahaziah's conduct was, that there was no God in Israel; which amounted to the sin of rebellion against the God of Israel. God also intimated to Isaiah, that those who should apply to diviners to discover the secrets of futurity, would cast off their allegiance to him. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards, that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God?" When any among the Jews either practised divination, or applied to diviners to know futurity, they acted as rebels against their God and King. For it was a practical renunciation of their allegiance to Jehovah, their rightful lawgiver and Judge. And if the heathens meant by divination, to apply to evil spirits for aid and assistance, they also rebelled against their own gods and their own government. So that divination in every point of view, was an evil, and, in some respects and under some circumstances, was extremely criminal, and deserved to be treated as a capital crime, like treason and rebellion.

[To be continued.]

For the Christian Magazine.

ON THE PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

In this paper I shall attempt to illustrate the perfect knowledge of God, by showing in what it consists, or what it must imply.

1. Perfect knowledge, must include the knowledge of all existences. Unless God knows all that has existed, and all that does and will exist, he cannot be perfect in knowledge. If there is any being, or thing, unknown to God, his knowledge would be limited and finite. He must perfectly know himself. He must know his own nature, and in what respects it differs from all other natures, and the mode and manner of his own existence and all his perfections. All the worlds that have been, or can be formed, with all that composes and inhabits them, must be objects of Divine knowledge. God must know every creature from insect to angel, all the unnumbered orders of creatures, with all the individuals that compose them, and all their properties, powers and conditions. The whole of being, however diversified or modified, whether of matter, or spirit, or of both, must be known by him. All this is evident, not only from the consideration of what must be included in perfect knowledge, but from other considerations. He must know all that he himself does. He is the Creator of all things. Without him was not any thing made, that is made. Nothing has existed, or does, or will exist, independently of his will and power. No forms of matter, or of life, can come into being without his pleasure and agency. The Bible ascribes unto God the knowledge of all his works. "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world. He looketh unto the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight."

2. In perfect knowledge are included not only all actual, but all *possible* existences. It would be absurd to suppose that real existences are all that possibly could exist. Other worlds and other creatures, other properties and forms of matter and of spirit were within the compass of pos-

sibility. Other things than those which do or ever will exist, might have been contrived and formed. What *is*, does not comprise all that might *possibly be*. God has not done all that he was able to do in creating. We can see that Almighty power might have produced more and different things, than those it actually has produced. God's power has been limited in its exercise, by his will, or pleasure, and not by impossibilities. He could have done otherwise, had it been his choice. In order to be perfect in knowledge, God must know all that it is possible could exist.

3. God must know the present system of things in all its operations, and in its particular and general results. There is a vast system of things. Relation, dependence and connexion subsist through the whole. The laws of matter and of mind are in constant operation, and are producing effects. Throughout material bodies there is motion, and among all intelligent natures, there are thought and action. We can trace the *immediate* effects and results, comparatively of but a few things, and the ultimate results of nothing. But we are of yesterday. Our knowledge is imperfect. God sees the *end from* the beginning. He looks through the whole of things, and sees them in all their intermediate causes and effects, in all their relations and dependencies, and well understands what will be the final result of that plan of things which he has adopted. If there is any motion, or event, if there is any influence, or effect, in any part of the system unknown to God; or if he is at a loss what will be the grand and final result of the whole of things, his knowledge is imperfect. Considering the goodness of God, we must believe that he would not have brought any thing into existence, concerning which he did not know what would be its tendency and its whole effect. Let it be remembered too, that God governs all things; he must, therefore, know in respect to all that he governs. He must be fully acquainted with the reasons of all and of every part of his own conduct. Though clouds and darkness are round about his throne in respect to us, yet it is not so in respect to himself.

4. To be perfect in knowledge, God must know what would have been the result of any different system of things. The present system was not the only one possible with God. He might have varied his present plan, in a countless number of respects. He might have formed one essentially and, perhaps, entirely different. The present is not a plan of necessity, but of choice. Because the present plan was possible, we are not to suppose that any other was impossible. It is not to my purpose here, to inquire whether this is the best plan; but to state, that others were possible, and if God had seen fit, he might have chosen some other. The natures, the properties, and the arrangement of things, might have been different from what they are. Before creation, the present system of things was possible, but it did not actually exist. So there were other possible systems which might have been brought into real existence; but they were not chosen. Now, in order to be perfect in knowledge, God must know all these, in all their operations and effects, and see what would be their respective and final results. If he does not,

he cannot be certain that the present system is not less wise than some other, and of consequence, it does not fully gratify his infinite benevolence.

5. To be perfect in knowledge, God must know, not only all the motions in all the inanimate parts of nature, but the thoughts, intentions, motives, and actions, of all his intelligent creatures. He must know them individually, and all that they think, intend and do, and be acquainted with all the principles and motives of their conduct. Their hearts and lives must all be open to his inspection. To us there is an inconceivable amount of intellectual and moral exercises put forth every moment in the universe of creatures. We know but a few of them, besides those of our own; but God must know them singly, through the whole intelligent creation. There cannot be a thought, or a purpose, or an act, pertaining to any being throughout all his immense works, unknown to him. If there is, his knowledge, like our own, would be imperfect. Not a single mental, or moral exercise, since the existence of an intelligent creature, is forgotten before God. All the past is the object of his present knowledge. Nor is there a future thought, exercise or action, less known to him than those of the present, or past. To suppose otherwise, would imply imperfection in divine knowledge, and would be to append some portion of ignorance to a being of infinite intelligence. The scriptures confirm what has been stated under this article. "The Lord is a God of knowledge; by him actions are weighed. I am He, and there is none else, declaring the *end from* the beginning, and from ancient times, the things which are not yet done. His eyes are upon the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings. The Lord searcheth all hearts and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts. I know the things that come into your minds, every one of you. I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and patience. Mine eyes are upon all their ways; neither is their iniquity hid from me."

6. Perfect knowledge, in God, includes that of the present *character* and *condition* of all his intelligent creatures. His knowledge of their character appears from what has already been proved. For if he knows all their hearts and all their conduct, he must know their true character. Their moral exercises and actions constitute, and cannot but constitute, their moral character. He cannot be, in the least degree, ignorant of the moral turpitude and moral excellence of any intelligent creature throughout his extended dominions. He knows the depravity and guilt of fallen angels and of fallen men. He knows the degree of holiness and of sin in the renewed on earth, and the degree of holiness in every glorified saint and in every angel of light. He knows the *past*, as well as the *present*, character of every moral being. If we should believe that he does not, we should not believe that he is perfect in knowledge. And he has as clear a view of his own character, as of the character of any of his intelligent creatures. Whilst God knows the character, he knows, also, the *condition* of every being that exists. He knows in what state all beings are, and what each enjoys or suffers in every part of creation. His infinite mind contemplates every part, and the whole amount of

suffering amongst all the creatures of his power. To him are known the pains and sorrows of his saints, and the sufferings of his enemies. Advert to what part of the universe you may, or to what individual you choose, God is a witness of every pain and of every joy that is felt. He knows what has been, as well as what is, and can tell, in every instance, what has been suffered and enjoyed, and what has been the cause of good and of evil. Concerning his people, God says, in his word, In all their afflictions, he was afflicted, and that they who touch them, touch the apple of his eye, and that he has a bottle for their tears. Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before you ask him. Respecting others, it is said, he does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men, and that he hears the sighing of the prisoner, and the groans of them who are appointed to die. These and similar passages imply God's knowledge of the particular condition of his creatures.

7. The knowledge of God cannot be perfect, unless he knows the future character and condition of all intelligent beings that do and will exist. The truth of this must be apparent upon the slightest reflection. His knowledge of the present and past character and condition of all rational natures might be complete and entire; and yet if he does not know what these will be in future, there must be a great defect in his knowledge. It could not, in truth, be declared to be perfect. He would not see the end from the beginning. When it is once admitted, that God is perfect in knowledge, it cannot fairly be denied, that he must know what character all his intelligent and moral creatures will form, and what will be their respective conditions in all future duration. To deny that he knows what these will be, is virtually to deny his omniscience, and of consequence, that he is perfect and is God. But who is prepared for such a denial, and thus to disallow to God, the glory that is due to his name? He has revealed himself as Omniscient, and as one to whom all things are known. "His understanding is infinite. God knoweth all things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do. Secret things belong unto the Lord our God." These passages assert and imply the omniscience of God, and virtually teach, that he knows the future character and condition of all intelligent creatures. From the particulars which have been stated and illustrated, it appears that the knowledge of God is perfect.

The reader will make his own reflections on the subject of this paper; but there is one which, probably, will not fail of being suggested to his mind.—It is this, that since God is perfect in knowledge, he is able, in any case, to determine what to do at one time, as well as at another. In numerous instances men are not. They have to wait for occurrences and for further knowledge. They can with no certainty determine what will be the course of events and the result of things. They have often to change their plans and their measures. As things proceed, their views alter, and they vary their determinations. It is not so with God. He has ever had all the knowledge that

he will ever possess, and all that is requisite to form his purpose concerning any being or event. He can determine as justly and as wisely at one time as at another. In itself considered, the difference is nothing, whether he decide what to do at the time of acting, or in any point of preceding duration. His conduct would be the same, and the event the same. Nothing is gained by supposing that God has no purposes respecting his own conduct previously to the time of his acting, if we allow that he does not act without designing to act.

MINORIS.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE CRIMINALITY OF UNBELIEF.

IT is a criminal thing to disbelieve what God has spoken. One fact is sufficient to support this assertion, and that is this: unbelief is condemned in the scriptures. The Israelites were censured for not believing the divine declarations respecting the promised land, and for their consequent refusal to go, at the command of God, to take possession of it. "And the Lord said unto Moses, how long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they *believe* me, for all the signs which I have showed among them? I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them."

Moses and Aaron were censured for their unbelief at the time when water was brought from the rock to allay the thirst of the people. "And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, because ye *believed me not* to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them."

In the New Testament, unbelief is censured in terms equally strong and decisive. "He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "If ye believe not that I am he," says the Saviour, "ye shall die in your sins."

Nothing can be more evident to every attentive reader, than that unbelief is condemned in all of the passages here quoted. If mankind are not criminal for their unbelief, it is impossible, I apprehend, to give any rational interpretation of these passages.

But here I shall be told, "that mankind always form their opinions in view of the evidence which is before them; that when they perceive evidence that any declaration is true they cannot help believing it; and that when they have not sufficient evidence of its truth, they cannot believe it, even if they would. As, therefore, they cannot control their opinions, it is unjust to censure them either for their belief, or unbelief." To all this, the fact, that God does censure those who disbelieve his declarations, is a sufficient reply. This fact, if we are satisfied of his goodness, is a conclusive argument that they are criminal, whether we are able to see the propriety of their being so considered or not. But we are not left in the dark on this subject. We are able, not only to ascertain as we have done the fact, that they are considered as criminal for their unbelief, but to see clearly the propriety of their being so considered. This is made evident, in the *first* place, from the fact, That

what God requires mankind to believe, is accompanied with sufficient evidence of its truth. God has never required any of his creatures to believe, without evidence to support their faith. His promise to the Israelites, that they should inherit the land of Canaan, was accompanied with sufficient evidence that it would be fulfilled. His oath on this subject was ample evidence. But as though this was not sufficient—as though they might doubt his ability, even when they were convinced of the sincerity of his intention to put them in possession of their inheritance, he followed his declaration with a series of miracles. The judgments which he brought upon Egypt for their sakes, their miraculous passage through the Red Sea, and their supply of bread and meat from heaven, fully evinced not only his purpose, but his ability, to perform his promise. The unbelief of this people, therefore, did not owe its existence to any want of evidence.

Christ did not require the Jews to believe that he was the Son of God, without evidence to support this claim. He showed them that the prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in him. He wrought a great variety of miracles, such as healing the sick, raising the dead, and casting out devils, to prove his mission from heaven. They did not disbelieve him because they had no evidence that he was the Son of God, but in opposition to all the evidence which was necessary to place this fact beyond a question.

Mankind are not now required to believe any thing without evidence of its truth. The divine authority of the scriptures is supported by the same prophecies and miracles, in connexion with numerous others, by which Christ proved himself to be the promised Messiah. What is said in the scriptures in regard to the character of God, the character and work of Christ, the character and state of man:—what is said in regard to the conditions of salvation, the existence of the soul after death, the resurrection of the body, a day of judgment, and future rewards and punishments, is in very plain, and unequivocal language. The declarations of Jehovah upon these practical and important subjects are not difficult to be understood. To suppose that he has given a revelation upon these subjects which his creatures cannot understand, is absurd. This is to suppose that he has, in fact, given them no revelation at all. If we admit that God has said any thing upon these important subjects, for the benefit of his creatures, we must admit that what he has said may be understood. There is evidence on all these, and indeed, upon every other important practical subject, sufficient to lead all, who attend to it as they ought, to a reception of the truth. Those, therefore, who reject the truth, do this, not by regarding the light of evidence, but by resisting it. But who will deny, that in resisting the light of evidence, there is criminality? Or who will hesitate to affirm, that all the unbelief, which is the consequence of such resistance, is sin?

2. Unbelief is often the consequence of neglecting the study of the scriptures. The proper means of ascertaining what God has said, is the study of his word. By studying this, and attending to the fulfilment of the prophecies which it contains, and the other evidence of its divine origin,

which will naturally come in their way, individuals may become satisfied that it *is* the word of God, and the only infallible guide of their faith and practice. By studying the doctrines and precepts which it contains, they may satisfy themselves in regard to what God has, and has not revealed. But there are many who disbelieve what God has said, who do not study the scriptures. They do not consult them to know whether mankind in their natural state are wholly sinful, or not;—whether they must be renewed in the spirit of their minds, or not;—whether salvation is wholly by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, or not;—whether the righteous will be forever happy, and the wicked forever miserable in a future state, or not; or whether God, as a Being of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, works all things after the counsel of his own will, or not. Some are so indifferent to the subject of religion as not to exercise their minds at all on questions like these. And many who do occasionally think and speak on these subjects, form their opinions much more from the conversation of others, and from their own unassisted reflections, guided by a dark understanding and a depraved heart, than from the study of the Bible. Now is it not evident, that those who disbelieve the declarations of God, in consequence of not studying his word, the appointed means of knowledge upon all subjects of religion, are criminal for their unbelief? What if they do not perceive evidence of the truth of this or that doctrine, or precept, which God has revealed? Can this circumstance excuse their unbelief, when they have ample evidence within their reach, and might examine it to their satisfaction? Certainly not. If in this case, they are so ignorant of the will of God as to reject it, they are criminal for their ignorance, and accountable for all the unbelief which is its necessary consequence.

3. Many disbelieve what God has said in consequence of not studying his word with a due degree of attention and constancy. This class do occasionally study the word of God; but they study it very unfrequently, and with a great degree of listlessness and inattention. They do not half so frequently take the Bible into their hands, as they do other books of infinitely less importance. And when they do look into this, they do not peruse it with any thing like the attention which they give to other books. They read the Bible, not with a determination to understand it, but, perhaps, to quiet conscience, which will not allow the total neglect of it; or to keep up the appearance of religion, which is deemed of importance by those among whom they live; or to find arguments to support a favorite hypothesis which they feel an interest in defending. Now although the will of God is very plainly revealed in the scriptures; yet we cannot expect that it will be known by those who indulge themselves in this state of carelessness and inattention. God did not give his word to be an infallible guide to those who will not peruse it; nor to those who will not peruse it with attention and constancy. It cannot be expected that persons of this description will know and receive the truth. They will doubtless reject it. And if they are criminal for their neglect of the scriptures, they must also be for that

unbelief which a due attention to them would have prevented.

4. A heart opposed to the truth, is another reason why so many disbelieve what God has spoken. The truth upon the subject of religion is disagreeable to sinners. This the Saviour asserts in language too plain to be misunderstood. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." Mankind in their natural state are all sinners. They, therefore, naturally hate the holiness of God, because this condemns them. Conscious that they are sinners, and disposed to continue in their sins, they naturally hate the character, law, and government of God, because these are all holy. For the same reason they hate the *truths*, which *relate* to the character, law, and government of God. Conscious that they are sinners, and disposed to continue in sin, they hate Christ because he, as a Saviour, brings their sins to light, and exhibits them to the universe in all their native deformity. For the same reason, they hate the whole plan of redemption which he is engaged in accomplishing. This, not only makes manifest their sins, but calls upon them in the most affecting and solemn manner to forsake them. They hate the truth respecting the judgment-day, and the retributions of eternity, because in these they see the disgrace and ruin which nothing but repentance can prevent.

Now this opposition of heart to what God has spoken, does more than any thing else to keep them in unbelief. Although it cannot influence them to disbelieve the truth, when all the evidence of it is before them; yet it can, and does influence them to turn away their attention from this evidence, so as not to feel its force. It influences them to seek after arguments in opposition to the truth, and prevents that patient, candid and impartial investigation of subjects, without which the truth can never be fully known. But can mankind be excusable for their unbelief, when it is the result of opposition to what is revealed? As opposition to the truth, which God has revealed, is itself criminal, all the unbelief which results from this must also be criminal.

5. Mankind are often led to disbelieve what God has spoken, in consequence of listening to those who contradict his declarations. The Israelites believed that the land of Canaan was a good land,—a "land that flowed with milk and honey," agreeably to the divine declaration, until ten of those who were sent to search it out, brought up an evil report respecting it. In consequence of listening to the false representations of these spies, the body of the people distrusted the word of God, and believed that the land was not worth possessing; or however valuable when possessed, it was absolutely beyond their reach. It was because they had listened to those who had contradicted him, that God says to Moses, "How long will this people provoke me? How long will it be ere they believe me?"

Our first parents believed God, until the Serpent came and contradicted him, saying, "Ye shall not surely die." As soon as they listened to, and believed in this declaration of the arch deceiver,

they could not believe what God had spoken. So it is with multitudes in every age; they begin to listen to those who contradict the sayings of the Most High, and then they of course disbelieve what he has said. But if mankind disbelieve what God has said in consequence of listening to those who contradict him, they are certainly criminal for their unbelief. They ought not to listen to those who contradict what God has said. They know, or may know from his word, what he has said, and knowing this, they act a very unwise and criminal part to listen to those who contradict him.

6. Individuals are sometimes led to disbelieve what God has spoken, in consequence of not humbly seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit in their researches after truth. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him," is the direction and the promise given to all who are desirous of knowing the truth. One means of coming to a knowledge of the truth,—a means which God himself has appointed, and which he delights to bless, is, seeking the guidance of his Spirit. But there are many who never ask with a humble, believing reliance upon God, for his direction in their researches after truth. They investigate every subject which comes before them, with a proud dependence upon the strength of their own understandings. Now, although God has made the truth plain to those who seek after it in his own appointed way; yet he has not made it so to those, who are under the influence of pride and self-sufficiency, and who seek after it, with a reliance upon their own unassisted reason. They may and do mistake. But as they are criminal for not seeking divine assistance, they must be criminal also for that unbelief which this assistance might have prevented.

The reason, then, why God censures unbelief, is plain: It is the result of improper affections or conduct. It does not arise, as is often pretended, from the want of evidence, but implies the neglect or abuse of the means of obtaining evidence, or a wilful resistance of its light when it cannot be wholly obscured. It is a species of dishonesty with God. The subjects of it do practically contradict his assertions, and renounce him as an object of their confidence. To say that this is criminal, is to tell but half the truth: It is also dangerous. It prevents the reception of the most important blessings which the gospel offers, and draws upon its unhappy subjects, the worst of evils which either the law or gospel threatens. A.

For the Christian Magazine.

A FAITHFUL EXHIBITION OF THE GOSPEL, THE OCCASION OF DIVISIONS AMONG MEN.

The gospel may be said to be faithfully exhibited, when all its doctrines are clearly, connectedly and fully preached; and when all its duties, with the obligations of men to perform them, and the consequences of performing and of neglecting to perform them, are clearly stated. The gospel is, in its own nature, a pure, peaceable and benevolent system. In its genuine tendency, it is suited to reconcile men to God and to one another. If all men were consistent Christians, peace on earth would be universal. Still, how-

ever, it is to be expected that the faithful exhibition of it will be the occasion of divisions among men.

1. From the fact, that the natural heart of man is strongly opposed to its doctrines and duties. The gospel represents men to be, by nature, guilty, condemned and ruined creatures; destitute of holiness, and possessed of hearts deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. It strikes at the root of all their pride and selfishness; and informs them, that they cannot merit the favour of God, against whom they have rebelled. It throws them into his hands, and represents him as angry with them every day. It gives him the throne of the universe, and declares that he works all things after the counsel of his own will, and that he has mercy on whom he will have mercy. It informs them that it is indispensably necessary for them to be born, not of the will of man, but of God, in order to be qualified for heaven, and admitted to its enjoyments. The gospel requires men to love God with all their hearts, and to act with a supreme and constant reference to his glory. It enjoins upon them repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the condition of forgiveness and salvation, and expressly informs them, that except they repent they shall perish; and except they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be damned. To these doctrines and duties, and to others implied in them, the natural hearts of men must, from the nature of the case, feel strong opposition. It is, then, to be expected, that a faithful exhibition of the gospel will be the occasion of divisions among men. Its enemies will manifest their opposition to its doctrines and duties by opposing those by whom they are faithfully preached and cordially embraced.

2. From numerous passages in the volume of inspiration. "I am come, said our Saviour, to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled? Suppose ye, that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay; but rather division. For, from henceforth, there shall be five in one house, divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." On other occasions he said, "Beware of men, for they will deliver you up to councils and they will scourge you in their synagogues, and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child, and the children shall rise up against their parents and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household. Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and shall cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore, the world hateth you." Who that considers these and similar passages, can

doubt whether a faithful exhibition of the gospel will be the occasion of divisions among men?

3. From the fact that a faithful exhibition of the gospel always has, in a greater, or less degree, been the occasion of divisions. It was so when the gospel was preached by Christ himself. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. Many of the people, therefore, when they heard this saying, said, of a truth, this is the Prophet. Others said, this is the Christ. But some said, shall Christ come out of Galilee? And there was a division among the people because of him." While some of the Pharisees said, this man is not of God, others asked, how can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? "And there was a division among them." The common people heard Christ gladly, while the Pharisees and other great men of the Jewish nation, treated both him and his doctrines with contempt. A faithful exhibition of his gospel did not cease to produce divisions among men after his ascension to heaven. By the preaching of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, many of the Jews, religious proselytes and Gentiles, were brought to embrace the gospel. "But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women and chief men of the city against Paul and Barnabas and expelled them out of their coasts. When they preached at Iconium a great multitude both of the Jews and Greeks believed; but the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and made their minds evil affected towards the brethren. *The multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews and part with the Apostles.* Similar divisions were produced by the preaching of the gospel at Thessalonica and at Athens, and in every place where it was then preached. After the death of the Apostles, divisions continued. The same cause produced the same effects wherever it operated. The arm of civil power was soon raised against the Christian Church. In the course of a few centuries, thousands and thousands of Christians suffered the cruelties and tortures of a malicious and ferocious persecution. From that period down to the present day, a faithful exhibition of the great truths and duties of Christianity has not failed to produce divisions among men. Here, I might advert to Luther and his colleagues at the time of the reformation in the sixteenth century. Through their instrumentality a broad line of distinction was made between the friends and the enemies of truth. Wherever the gospel is faithfully preached in the time in which we live, divisions are created to a greater or less extent. By some, divine truth is gladly heard and cordially received; by others, it is heard with disgust and rejected. It becomes the occasion of animosity and contention on the part of those by whom it is not believed. But the thing which has been, is that which shall be, and that which is done, is that which shall be done. From the fact, that a faithful exhibition of the gospel ever has been the occasion of divisions among men, we may, with great certainty, infer, that it will continue to be the occasion of them.

If the proposition which I have endeavoured to establish be true, we see in what estimation that kind of preaching is to be held, against which no opposition of heart is excited. That there is

such a kind of preaching prevalent, at the present day, is an undeniable fact. It disrobes the Saviour of his divinity, does not admit his sufferings and death to be a proper sacrifice for sin, overlooks the entire depravity of the unsanctified heart, rejects the doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, rings perpetual changes on the beauty of virtue and charity, implies that nearly all persons are real Christians, and seldom says any thing respecting the punishment of the wicked in a future state. Against such preaching, it is well known, that no opposition of heart is excited. And why should there be, since it accords with the feelings of the unsanctified heart? But in what estimation is such kind of preaching to be held? Is it not to be regarded as essentially unlike that of the Prophets, of Christ, and of his Apostles? Did not their preaching meet with violent opposition, and occasion divisions among men? If Christ were again to appear and should preach the same doctrines and duties which he inculcated while he tabernacled with men, can there be the least doubt what would be the result? Suppose that Paul were to descend to earth and preach all those things which are found in his Epistles? would there not be divisions? Would multitudes be any more reconciled to them dispensed from his lips, than from his pen? It requires no small share of self-denial in a minister, to read without note or comment, some parts of his Epistles, to many congregations in the nineteenth century. Observe, then, the striking difference between much of the preaching which is desired and is current in some places, and that of Christ and of his Prophets and Apostles.

The truth of the general proposition suggests the remark, that ministers who faithfully preach the gospel, cannot reasonably expect to escape opposition. The Prophets were hated and opposed on account of the messages of God which they delivered. "Woe is me, my mother," exclaimed Jeremiah, "that thou hast borne me a man of strife and of contention to the whole earth. I have neither lent on usury, nor have men lent me on usury, yet every one of them doth curse me." The Lord Jesus Christ was, also, violently opposed, on account of the doctrines and duties which he preached. And he forewarned his first ministers, that they would be hated and persecuted on the same account. Accordingly we find that they were strongly and constantly opposed, wherever they preached the gospel. With two or three exceptions, they were all put to an ignominious death. Can, then, the faithful minister of the gospel, at the present day, expect to escape opposition? He preaches the same doctrines which were preached by Christ and his Apostles. The hearts of men are the same now as they were in the apostolic age. In the moral, no less than in the natural world, it must be expected, that similar combinations of causes, operating under similar combinations of circumstances, will be productive of similar effects. There is, therefore, no principle on which the faithful minister of the gospel can reasonably found an expectation of escaping opposition. He may not, indeed, be persecuted unto death, by the civil power; but the enemies of the truth will mani-

fest, in some form, their opposition to those by whom it is dispensed.

It is a fact well known, that sinners frequently go from the sanctuary, disturbed with the doctrines of the gospel which they have heard. This is not to be considered as an unfavourable circumstance. So long as sinners are undisturbed by a faithful exhibition of the gospel, it cannot be expected, that the word will be instrumental of their conversion. This can be looked for only, when the word awakens their attention, convinces them of sin, and leads them to inquire what they shall do to be saved. But when these effects are produced, they are disturbed, and are disposed to complain, either of the preacher, or of the sentiments which he advances. Their condition, under such circumstances, is more hopeful than that of those who are never disturbed in their moral slumbers, by a faithful exhibition of divine truth. They will be more likely to search the Scriptures to see whether things are so, and to come to a knowledge of the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ.

It may yet further be remarked, that divisions among men will be occasioned by a faithful exhibition of the gospel, until the Millennium. During that period, which will be at least a thousand years, all will know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, and the people will be all righteous. Until that time, divisions will continue. The grand reason why a faithful exhibition of the gospel now occasions divisions among men, is, because their hearts are naturally opposed to its holy and humbling doctrines and duties. These will, no doubt, continue to be inculcated until the Millennial day, and there will, until that time, be wicked men in the world. Hence divisions will continue. It is, in itself considered, to be lamented, that any should hate and oppose the truth. But where religious divisions exist, in consequence of a faithful exhibition of the gospel, the blame is to be attached, not to the gospel itself, nor to those by whom it is dispensed, but to those by whom it is opposed. The religious divisions which are so frequently occurring in New England at the present day, are, in many instances, the natural consequence of a faithful exhibition of truth. The existence of them affords evidence, that the truth as it is in Jesus, is in many places, faithfully preached, and that the cause of the Redeemer is yet maintained in this region. Is it not more desirable that religious divisions should be multiplied, than that the gospel should not be faithfully preached, and men, in thick succession, should go undisturbed to endless ruin? F.

From the Christian Observer.

PART IV.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH.

[Continued from page 23.]

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

When I sat down to communicate my *Thoughts on the Sabbath* to the Christian Observer, my design was to avoid, as much as possible, the appearance of controversy; and merely to state what I conceived to be the doctrine of scripture. But as this subject has been treated at large by a modern author, of high reputation in the learned world, who has shown the great utility of sabbatical institutions, but whose views do not altogether coincide with mine, it

might appear supercilious in me to omit taking particular notice of the arguments which he had adduced to prove that the Sabbath was not instituted till after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and remained in force only during the Jewish Dispensation. In my preceding papers, I have not been inattentive to the arguments of this author, and have already, in effect, given a reply to some of them. I now proceed to consider those of which I have hitherto taken no notice, or to which my answers have not been sufficiently explicit.

P. This author candidly acknowledges, that "if the divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it."*

It becomes us, then, to weigh, with the utmost caution the words of scripture, respecting the transactions of the *seventh day*, as recorded in the book of Genesis. If this passage declares, that God *then* blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; all debate about the extent of the obligation of a sabbatical institution is precluded.

But it is objected that "the words" (Gen. ii. 3) "do not assert that God then blessed and sanctified the seventh day; but that he blessed and sanctified it *for that reason;*" *because that on it he had rested from all his works*, &c.; "and if any ask, why the Sabbath or sanctification of the seventh day was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed; the answer is at hand—the order of connexion and not of time, introduced the mention of the Sabbath, in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate."*

I am here at issue with the author whom I have quoted, as, in my apprehension, the words in Genesis do clearly assert, that God *then* blessed and sanctified the seventh day as well as that he sanctified it, *because* that on it he had rested from all his works of creation.

In the first and beginning of the second chapter of Genesis, we have a distinct chronological account of the first seven days, after it had pleased God to begin the stupendous work of creation. The transactions of the seventh day are as distinctly marked as those of any other day, with this difference only, that with respect to the six preceding days, the work is first mentioned and then the day; whereas with respect to the seventh, the day is first mentioned and then its transactions are enumerated.

On the first day, God said, *Let there be light, and there was light.* On the sixth *God created man in his own image;* and on the seventh day, *God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had made; and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that on it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.* All the transactions enumerated in this passage belong to the seventh day as clearly, in my apprehension, as the creation of man belongs to the sixth; nor can I discover any thing in the passage, except the division into verses, which could mislead a reader of plain understanding. On the seventh day God ended his work and

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 80.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 76.

rested, and blessed the day, and sanctified it. All these things are mentioned as having taken place on that day. It is as expressly declared that he *then* blessed and sanctified the day, as that he rested on it. I do not know how we can prove any thing from the scriptures, if a passage so plain as this is not to be understood in its obvious sense, unless some subsequent revelation, equally clear, had compelled us to adopt another meaning.

The literal sense of the words is confirmed by the reason which is given for the sanctification of the seventh day. God sanctified the day, BECAUSE, *that in it, he had rested from all his work which God had created and made.* One design of the original institution was to celebrate the work of creation; and when should we expect the celebration to commence? Surely at the time immediately succeeding the transaction to be celebrated. The Almighty has, since the creation, frequently appointed periodical times and significant actions, for the purpose of commemorating signal interpositions of his providence or remarkable mercies vouchsafed to mankind. In all these cases, the celebration was directed to commence from the period of the mercy to be celebrated. The Passover began with the deliverence of the Israelites; and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, at the death of Christ. But to suppose that an institution, designed to commemorate the creation of the world, had no existence till two thousand years after the event, is so strange in itself, and so contrary to the conduct of God on similar occasions, that the idea cannot be received without a clear warrant from Scripture.

2. "If the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import—it appears unaccountable, that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it, should occur either in the general history of the world, before the call of Abraham, which contains, we admit, only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives of the three first *Jewish* patriarchs, which, in many parts of the account is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic."*

If the argument contained in this passage proves any thing, it will prove too much. It will prove, that the observance of the Sabbath ceased during upwards of four hundred years after its institution in the wilderness; for in all that period, we have "no mention of it," nor does "the obscurest allusion to it occur." The history of the settlement of the Jews in Canaan, as related in the book of Joshua, is, in many parts of it, so circumstantial, that one might have expected to find some mention of this important institution. The Israelites marched round the city of Jericho in military array, during seven successive days, (Josh. vi.) one of which must have been the Sabbath; yet no express "permission is recorded to dispense with the institution" during this week. The book of Judges contains a series of revolts from the worship of the true God, and of deliverances from the miseries which these revolts brought upon the Jews. Yet we find in the history no reproof for the contempt of the sabbatical institution,

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 75.

though this was a crime particularly marked by the prophets, as a principal cause of the national punishments inflicted on that favoured, yet perverse people.

We argue unfairly, and in a manner injurious to religion, when we oppose the silence of scripture in one part, to its express declarations contained in another. Abraham is particularly commended by the Almighty, for his care in *commanding his children and household to keep the way of the Lord;* and we are certain, that *Abraham rejoiced to see the day of Christ, and he saw it and was glad.* John, viii. 36. Yet where do we find in the Old Testament, the least hint that he communicated this most important branch of knowledge to his family?

The sacrifices under the Mosaic law, were typical of the atoning sacrifice made for our salvation by the death of Christ, and Moses was instructed in the typical nature of the ceremonial law, when he received the commands of God respecting that institution. *The law had a shadow of good things to come.* Heb. x. 1. The service of the tabernacle afforded a figure *for the time then present,* ch. ix. 9; and the Jewish priests *served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,* AS MOSES WAS ADMONISHED OF GOD *when he was about to make the tabernacle,* ch. viii. 5. Yet where is this chief design of the ceremonial law mentioned in the writings of Moses, though it is explicitly and repeatedly taught in the New-Testament?

The silence of some parts of the scripture respecting the Sabbath, cannot, therefore, with justice, be opposed to the declarations which we find concerning it in other parts of the word of God.

3. It is objected, that in the 16th chapter of Exodus, where the Sabbath is first mentioned, after the passage in Genesis already quoted, there is not "any intimation that the Sabbath then appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten or suspended."*

I wish your readers to examine this chapter with attention, and consider, whether the language, upon the first mention of the Sabbath, is more suitable to an old institution, "neglected or suspended," or to one which was totally unknown. The Israelites having murmured in the wilderness for want of food, God graciously promises them a miraculous supply. *Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out, and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.* Ex. xvi. 4, 5. The people obeyed this injunction, and *on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses.* ver. 22. *And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.* ver. 23.

Is this language suitable to a solemnity which had never been instituted? As the Ten Commandments had not, at this time, been delivered to the Israelites, the duty of sanctifying the seventh day must have been totally un-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 75.

known, if no prior command on this subject had existed. Whereas the preparation for the sabbatical rest, the conduct of the rulers of the congregation, and the reply of Moses, appear much more suitable to the revival of a neglected institution, than to the appointment of a new one. We may be sure that, during the oppressive bondage of Egypt, no such rest could have been observed; but the Israelites having now escaped from their oppressors, the institution is revived, and a preparation for its celebration is commanded, before any mention is made of the institution itself. And when that preparation is completed, the Sabbath is mentioned as a solemnity already commanded: *This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.*

4. "This interpretation," that the Sabbath was first instituted in the wilderness, "is strongly supported by a passage in the prophet *Ezekiel*, where the Sabbath is plainly spoken of as given, and what else can that mean but as *first instituted* in the wilderness?" Nehemiah also recounts the promulgation of the sabbatical law amongst the transactions in the wilderness.*

The passage in Ezekiel is as follows: *I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness, and I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths.* Chap. xx. 10, 11.

If this passage proves that the Sabbath was first instituted in the wilderness, it will prove that the other commandments of the moral law were then first promulgated; for the language respecting all the commandments is precisely the same. "I *gave* them my statutes—I also gave them my Sabbaths." Yet we are sure that the moral law was made known to mankind before its promulgation at Mount Sinai. The sixth and seventh commandments, for instance, were ordained from the beginning. Genesis ix. 16. Matt. xix. 8. Indeed the whole tenor of the Bible, before the Israelites formed a distinct nation, shows that mankind were not left without the knowledge of God's laws; *for where no law is, there is no transgression.* Rom. iv. 5.

The passage in Nehemiah is of the same import with that in Ezekiel. *Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.* As the *true laws* and *good statutes* contained in the ten commandments were not then first given, though they were then proclaimed in a more awful manner, so neither was the Sabbath then first instituted. As far as we can deduce an argument from a similarity of language, this must be the consequence. The expression, *made known*, is used in scripture, where the first intimation of the thing cannot be intended; as *God* MADE KNOWN *his* ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel, Ps. ciii. 7; though this was not the first communication of his will, nor manifestation of his acts to mankind.

5. "The Sabbath is described as a sign between God and the people of Israel. Exod. xx. 12, and xxxi. 16, 17. Now it does not seem easy to understand how the Sabbath could be a *sign* be-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, 8vo. ed, vol. ii. p. 76.

tween God and the people of Israel, unless the observance of it was peculiar to that people and designed to be so."*

By a *sign*, I understand something that should distinguish the people of God from all the heathen nations by whom they were surrounded. The Jews while they continued obedient, were distinguished by their rest from ordinary labours every seventh day, and their dedication of it to the worship of Jehovah. This would mark them out as a peculiar people, devoted to God's service. But this will not prove, that no obligation lay upon any other people to observe a sabbatical institution. The observance of all God's commandments was to be a *sign*, or *badge*, by which the people of God were to be distinguished from other nations. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart. And thou shalt bind them for a* SIGN *upon thine hand.* Deut. vi. 4, &c. That is, thou shalt consider them as a badge or mark of distinction by which the world may know thou art indeed the people of God. But none of the commandments would distinguish them as a people devoted to the service of God, in so peculiar a manner as the fourth. Their disobedience to this command is, therefore, often specified by the Prophets as a special cause of the punishments which God inflicted on that nation.

6. "The distinction of the Sabbath is, in its nature, as much a positive ceremonial institution as that of many other seasons which were appointed by the Levitical law to be kept holy."*

It is not possible to conceive any duty to be more strictly moral, or of more universal obligation, than that of worshipping Almighty God. And if it is our duty to join in acts of publick and social worship, some fixed time must be appointed for the exercise of this duty. There is, therefore, nothing more of a positive or ceremonial nature in a sabbatical institution, than what arises from the necessity of the case. He, who made us for his own pleasure, is surely the best judge what portion of our time ought to be dedicated to his more immediate worship and service. It does not appertain to us to inquire why the Almighty confined his work of creation to six days; why he rested on the seventh, or why he commanded us to sanctify this portion of our time: but such an institution certainly rests upon different grounds from those festivals, which God commanded the Jews to observe, in commemoration of mercies peculiar to that nation. It requires no great discernment to see the difference between dwelling in booths, at a certain period of the year, to commemorate the protection which the Jewish nation received in the wilderness, and the weekly celebration of the mercies of creation and redemption, which are as extensive as the globe which we inhabit.

Whether the Sabbath should be celebrated on the first or seventh day of the week, is, undoubtedly, a circumstance of a positive nature; but it is a circumstance which does not alter the duties peculiar to the Sab-

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 81.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii, p. 81.

bath. The day on which this institution ought to be observed, might have been, and, I doubt not, actually was altered by the authority of our Saviour, without any alteration in the substance of the commandment.

7. "If the command by which the Sabbath was instituted, be binding on Christians, it must bind as to the day, the duties and the penalty; in none of which it is received."*

The *duties* of the Sabbath are without doubt, essential to the institution; but the *day* is not essential. By the *penalty*, our author, I suppose, means that of death, which was directed to be inflicted on the Sabbath breaker under the Jewish dispensation. But if there be any argument in this assertion, it will prove, that the punishments incurred by a breach of the other commandments of the moral law, ought to be inflicted on offending Christians. It will prove that the idolater, the blasphemer, the adulterer, and the stubborn, rebellious son, as well as the Sabbath breaker, ought to be put to death under the gospel dispensation.

8. "The observance of the Sabbath was not one of the articles enjoined by the Apostles in the 15th chap. of Acts, upon them, *which from the Gentiles were turned unto God.*"*

In addition to the ceremonial pollutions, from which the Gentile Christians were commanded to abstain, the Apostle mentions the crime of *fornication*. But we are incompetent to judge, why the breach of one command only of the moral law is interdicted in this place. Little weight ought surely to be attached to such negative arguments, respecting the obligation of the fourth commandment of the moral law, since they oppose the positive declaration of our Saviour, that he came not to remove one jot or tittle of this law; which the Apostle Paul also declares was not intended to be made void by faith in Jesus Christ.

Those of your readers, who are unacquainted with the work whence the above quotations are taken, may be ready to conclude, that the author meant to speak disrespectfully of sabbatical institutions, which is by no means the case. He has shown their great utility, and has proved that "the *assembling* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity, of divine appointment." He concludes also, that "the resting on that day from our employments," is a duty "binding on the conscience of every individual, in a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established."*

The most careful consideration, which I have been able to give this subject, has produced a firm persuasion in my mind, that the obligation to this duty is of universal extent; and this seems to have been the view which the primitive Christians had of the subject, as appears from a quotation which our author has made from the works of Irenæus. *Unusquisque nostrum Sabbatizat spiritualiter, meditatione legis gaudens, opificium Dei admirans. Each of us spends the Sabbath in a spiritual manner, meditating on the law of God with delight, and contemplating his workmanship with admiration.*

Let it be remembered that Irenæus had been instructed by Polycarp, who was the disciple of

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 82.
† Ib. 81.

* Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 8vo. ed. vol. ii. p. 86.

the Apostle John;* that in this passage he is not describing any doctrine or practice peculiar to himself, but the general conduct of Christians; that he appropriates the title of *Sabbath* to that day which was set apart for religious exercises, and which was undoubtedly the first day of the week; that the manner of spending this day by the early Christians, corresponds with the description of the Sabbath given by Isaiah; that what the Jewish prophet commanded, the Christians practised; and can any reasonable doubt remain that the Christian church had been instructed by the Apostles and their immediate successors, to sanctify the first day of the week *as a Sabbath unto the Lord?* A more direct historical testimony of this important fact need not be required. W. H.

* Thus Irenæus speaks, "I can describe the very spot in which Polycarp sat and expounded, and the sermons which he preached to the multitude, and how he related to us his converse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; how he mentioned their particular expressions, and what things he had heard from them of the Lord, and of his miracles, and of his doctrines. As Polycarp had received from the eye-witnesses of the word of life, he told us all things agreeable to the Scriptures. Milner's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. i. p. 312. 2d ed. Life of Irenæus.

DECEPTION OR HYPOCRISY IN DEATH.

Messrs. Editors,—I wish you, or some of your correspondents would warn the public against a dangerous impression, which seems to have been too generally received, that all which is said by a dying man is to be received as truth. That mankind are generally sincere in their declarations at death, is doubtless true. But their sincerity, it is to be considered, does not, even at this hour, secure them from deception. If they have been sincere in a false opinion through life, it is to be expected, that they will sincerely retain it, at death. There is seldom any new light reflected upon the understanding, at this late and dark hour.

Nor is it altogether incredible that the same self-imposition or hypocrisy, which some people practise upon themselves and others through life, should be attempted at death. Will it be said, that at this solemn hour, they can have no motives to deception? True, it would seem so. But the fact may be different from what we should, at first view, suspect. Is that heart, which has resisted through life, the most powerful motives to honesty and fair dealing, with itself, and with others, and yielded to the paltry considerations which have tempted it to deception, to be trusted in death? May not the same love of error, the same pride of opinion, the same propensity to self-justification, and the same desire to be thought consistent and firm, which are among the most prominent features of human nature, retain their influence over men as long as reason continues, and lead them at death to declare their belief in opinions which they have avowed merely for convenience's sake, and their innocence in regard to actions of which they are verily guilty? "Rosseau, the hardened villany of whose life is almost without a parallel in modern times, and who seems to have assumed the mask of virtue for no other purpose, than that of propagating with more success, the blackest vice, says, in that very work which contains a confession of his crimes, that no man can come to the throne of God, and say, *I am a better man than Rosseau.*" And just before he expired, he observed to his mistress, "Ah! my dear,

how happy a thing it is to die, when one has no reason for remorse or self-reproach!" Then addressing himself to the Almighty, he said, "Eternal Being! the soul, that I am going to give thee back, is as pure at this moment, as it was when it proceeded from thee; render it the partaker of thy felicity."

A QUESTION.

Messrs. Editors,—I have often heard from the pulpit, and read in the works of respectable divines, that true religion consists in disinterested love to God and man. Will you, or some of your correspondents inform me through the medium of the Christian Magazine, how this definition of religion is consistent with the words of James,—"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world?" DISCIPULUS.

A REQUEST.

Messrs. Editors,—It has become somewhat fashionable in the vicinity of my residence, for religious societies to settle ministers with the understanding, that they shall be dismissed whenever a majority, or two thirds of their people shall desire it; or whenever the ministers themselves shall choose to leave their people; the party desiring the dissolution of the connexion to give the other six months' notice. Now I should be glad to have your opinion in regard to the expediency of this practice. A READER.

Missionary Intelligence.

From the Missionary Herald.

A BRIEF VIEW OF THE MISSIONS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

I. AMERICAN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

MISSIONS at BOMBAY—in CEYLON—among the CHEROKEES, the CHOCTAWS, and the CHEROKEES-OF-THE-ARKANSAS—at the SANDWICH ISLANDS—MALTA—in SYRIA—in PALESTINE—and at BUENOS AYRES. Measures have also been taken to ascertain the religious and moral state of CHILI, PERU, and COLOMBIA.

BOMBAY.

About 1,300 miles, travelling distance, west of Calcutta. Population of the island about 200,000. Commenced in 1813. Stations at Bombay, Mahim, and Tannah.

Bombay.—A large city on an island of the same name. Rev. Gordon Hall, and Rev. Edmund Frost, *Missionaries*, James Garrett, *Printer*; and their wives.

Mahim.—Six miles from Bombay, on the north part of the island. Rev. Allen Graves, *Missionary*, and Mrs. Graves.

Tannah.—The chief town on the island of Salsette, 25 miles from Bombay. Mrs. Elisabeth

Nichols, *widow of the Rev. John Nichols, who died Dec.* 9, 1824.

CEYLON.

A large island in the Indian sea, separated from the coast of Coromandel by a channel, called the Straits of Manaar. Length 300 miles, breadth 200. Population 1,500,000. Commenced in 1816. Stations at Tillipally, Batticotta, Oodooville, Panditeripo, and Manepy.

Tillipally.—Nine miles north of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Henry Woodward, *Missionary;* and Mrs. Woodward. Nicholas Permander, *Native Preacher.*

Batticotta.—Six miles northwest of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, *Missionary*, Rev. Daniel Poor, *Missionary and Principal of the Central School;* and their wives. Gabriel Tissera, *Native Preacher.*

Oodooville.—Five miles north of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Miron Winslow, *Missionary;* and Mrs. Winslow. George Koch, *Native Medical Assistant.*

Panditeripo.—Nine miles northwest of Jaffnapatam. Rev. John Scudder, M. D. *Missionary and Physician;* and Mrs Scudder.

Manepy.—Four miles and an half north-west of Jaffnapatam. Rev. Levi Spaulding, *Missionary;* and Mrs. Spaulding.

The number of native children boarding in the families of the missionaries, is 155. The number of natives belonging to the church is 73. The number of native free schools is 59. The number of boys in these schools, is 2,414, and that of girls, 255; total 2,669. Two revivals of religion were experienced during the year 1824; and 41 natives, the first fruits of the first revival, were admitted to the church.

THE CHEROKEES.

A tribe of Indians inhabiting a tract of country included within the chartered limits of the States of Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Population about 15,000. Commenced in 1817. Stations at Brainerd, Creek Path, Carmel, Hightower, Willstown, Haweis, and Candy's Creek.

Brainerd.—Within the chartered limits of Tennessee, 240 miles N. W. of Augusta, and 150 S. E. of Nashville. Rev. Samuel A. Worcester, *Missionary*, John C. Elsworth, *Teacher and Superintendent of Secular Concerns*, Henry Parker, and John Vail, *Farmers*, Ainsworth E. Blunt, *Farmer and Mechanic;* and their wives; Josiah Hemmingway, *Farmer;* Sophia Sawyer, *Teacher.*

Carmel.—Sixty miles S. E. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Georgia. Moody Hall, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Hall; William Hubbard Manwaring, *Farmer.*

Creek Path.—One hundred miles W. S. W. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Alabama. Rev. William Potter, *Missionary*, Dr. Elizur Butler, *Teacher*, Fenner Bosworth, *Farmer;* and their wives; Ermina Nash.

Hightower.—Eighty miles S. S. E. of Brainerd. Isaac Proctor, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Proctor.

Willstown.—About 50 miles S. W. of Brainerd, just within the chartered limits of Alabama. Rev. Ard Hoyt, Rev. William Chamberlain, *Missionaries;* and their wives; Rev. Daniel S. Buttrick, *Missionary*, Sylvester Ellis, *Farmer;* and Mrs. Ellis.

Haweis.—About 55 miles W. of S. from Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Georgia. Frederick Elsworth, *Teacher and Farmer;* and Mrs. Elsworth.

Candy's Creek.—About 25 miles N. E. of Brainerd, within the chartered limits of Tennessee. William Holland, *Teacher and Farmer;* and Mrs. Holland.

Mr. and Mrs. Dean have been obliged to leave Brainerd and come to the north, on account of Mrs. Dean's declining health.

THE CHOCKTAWS.

A tribe of Indians, residing between the Tombigbee and Mississippi rivers, almost wholly within the chartered limits of Mississippi. Population about 20,000. Commenced in 1818. Stations at Elliot, Mayhew, Bethel, Emmaus, Goshen, Iikhunnuh, and at three other places not yet named. All these stations are within the chartered limits of Mississippi.

WESTERN DISTRICT.

Elliot.—Situated on the Yalo Busha Creek; 400 miles W. S. W. of Brainerd. John Smith, *Farmer and Superintendent of Secular Concerns*, Joel Wood, *Teacher*, and their wives; Zechariah Howes, *Farmer and Mechanic*, Anson Dyer, *Catechist*, and Lucy Hutchinson.

Bethel.—About 60 miles S. E. of Elliot, and the same distance S. W. of Mayhew. Stephen B. Macomber, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Macomber; Philena Thatcher.

Capt. Harrison's.—Near Pearl river, more than 100 miles southeasterly from Elliot. Anson Gleason, *Teacher.*

NORTH-EAST DISTRICT.

Mayhew.—Ninety miles E. of Elliot. Rev. Cyrus Kingsbury, *Missionary and Superintendent of the Choctaw Mission*, Dr. William W. Pride, *Physician*, Calvin Cushman, *Farmer;* and their wives; William Hooper, *Teacher;* Anna Burnham, *Teacher.*

Mooshoolatubbee's.—About 20 miles from Mayhew, in a southeasterly direction. Adin C. Gibbs, *Teacher.*

I-ik-hun-nuh.—A settlement about 30 miles W. of Mayhew. Rev. Cyrus Byington, *Missionary*, David Wright, *Teacher*, and Mrs. Wright; Mrs. Moseley.

SOUTH-EAST DISTRICT.

Emmaus.—About 140 miles, in a south-easterly direction from Mayhew. Moses Jewell, *Mechanic*, David Gage, *Teacher;* and their wives.

Mr. Juzon's.—About 100 miles south-easterly from Mayhew. Orasmus L. Nash, *Teacher.*

Goshen.—About 115 miles S. by West from Mayhew Rev. Alfred Wright, *Missionary*, Elijah Bardwell, *Teacher;* and their wives; Ebenezer Bliss, *Farmer;* Eliza Buer.

Within the past year the mission has experienced a severe loss in the death of Mrs. Hooper. She died June 4th, in a very happy state of mind.

THE CHEROKEES OF THE ARKANSAS.

Cherokees, who, from the year 1804 to the present time, have removed from their residence E. of the Mississippi, to a tract of country on the N. bank of the Arkansas river. Population about 5,000. Commenced in 1820.

Dwight—The only station, is situated on the west side of Illinois creek; four miles north of the Arkansas river; 500 miles from the junction of the Arkansas with the Mississippi, following the course of the river; and about 200 miles in a direct line from its mouth. Rev. Alfred Finney and Rev. Cephas Washburn, *Missionaries*, George L. Weed, M. D. *Teacher and Physician*, Jacob Hitchcock, *Steward*, James Orr,

Farmer, Samuel Wisner and Asa Hitchcock, *Mechanics;* and their wives; Ellen Stetson, *Teacher;* Cynthia Thrall.

The school for boys, and the school for girls have made very encouraging progress. The children are contented, and their parents are satisfied. Nearly one fourth of the pupils were so far advanced, as to have commenced the study of geography about a year since. Many read the scriptures intelligibly. The pupils, in general, are docile in their dispositions, quick in their apprehension, prompt in obedience, active in their sports, and diligent in their studies.—These children were, but a little while ago, wandering in the forest, totally without mental or moral cultivation.

THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

A group of islands in the Pacific ocean—extended in a direction W. N. W. and E. S. E. The estimated length, breadth, and superficial contents, of each island, are as follows:

	Length.	Breadth.	Square miles.
Hawaii,	97 miles,	78	4,000
Maui,	48	29	600
Tahurawa,	11	8	60
Ranai,	17	9	100
Morokai,	40	7	170
Oahu,	46	23	520
Tauai,	28	32	520
Niihau,	20	7	80
Taura, Morokini,	Little more than barren rocks.		

Established in 1820. Stations on *Oahu*, at Honoruru; on *Tauai*, at Waimea; on *Maui*, at Lahaina; on *Hawaii*, at Kairua, Waiakea, and Kaavaroa.

OAHU.

Honoruru.—Rev. Hiram Bingham, *Missionary*, Elisha Loomis *Printer*, Abraham Blatchley, M. D. *Physician;* and their wives; Levi Chamberlain, *Superintendent of Secular Concerns.*

TAUAI.

Waimea.—Samuel Whitney, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, and Mrs. Whitney; George Sandwich, *Native Assistant.*

MAUI.

Lahaina.—Rev. William Richards, and Rev. Charles Samuel Stewart, *Missionaries*, and their wives; Betsey Stockton, colored woman, *Domestic Assistant.*

HAWAII.

Kairua.—Rev. Asa Thurston, and Rev. Artemas Bishop, *Missionaries*, and their wives; John Honorii, *Native Assistant.*

Waiakea.—Joseph Goodrich, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, Samuel Ruggles, *Teacher;* and their wives.

Kaavaroa.—James Ely, *Licensed Preacher and Missionary*, and Mrs. Ely. Thomas Hopu, *Native Assistant.*

Eight churches have been erected for the public worship of the true God, principally by the native chiefs. In some of them large congregations assemble.

The schools flourish. *Fifty* natives, who have been taught to read and write by the missionaries, were, at the latest dates, employed as school-masters. Between *two and three thousand* individuals, of both sexes, and all ages and ranks, were receiving regular instruction in the schools.

MALTA.

An island in the Mediterranean, 20 miles long, and 12 broad. It is about 50 miles from Sicily. On this island, anciently called Melita, the Apostle Paul was shipwrecked, while on his way to Rome. Commenced in 1821. Rev. Daniel Temple, *Missionary*, and Mrs. Temple.

SYRIA.

Syria is said, by writers on geography, to be bounded, S. E. and

S. by the desert of Arabia, and W. by the Mediterranean. Its north eastern and eastern limits are not well defined. In this larger sense it includes Palestine. It seems proper, however, that these two interesting tracts of country should be considered as separate and distinct. The only station in Syria is at

Beyroot.—A sea-port town at the foot of Mount Lebanon. Population not less than 5,000. Rev. William Goodell, and Rev. Isaac Bird, *Missionaries*, and their wives.

PALESTINE, OR THE HOLY LAND.

Including all the territory anciently possessed by the Israelites.

Jerusalem.—The capital of Palestine. Population estimated at from 15,000 to 20,000. Rev. Pliny Fisk, and Rev. Jonas King, *Missionaries.*

BUENOS AYRES.

One of the South American Republics. Rev. Theophilus Parvin, *Missionary.*

Mr. Parvin has established an Academy in Buenos Ayres, containing about 70 scholars—some of them children of men of high rank. The Bible is one of the reading books.

In September, a bill passed the Legislature declaring, that *the right which man has to worship God according to his conscience, is inviolable in that Province.*

CHILI, PERU, AND COLOMBIA.

Republics in South America. Rev. John C. Brigham, *Travelling Agent.*

Mr. Brigham sailed from Boston, in company with Mr. Parvin, July 25, 1823. It is expected he will return to the United States during the present year.

FOREIGN MISSION SCHOOL.

Situated in Cornwall, Conn. Established in 1816. Rev. Amos Basset, D. D. *Principal.*

About 60 heathen youths, from various nations, have, at different times, been members of this school. A large proportion of these youths, became hopefully pious, while members of the school. The present number of scholars is 14.

SUMMARY.

Whole number of Preachers of the Gospel from this country,		34
Native Preachers and Interpreters,	6	
Laborers from this country, including missionaries, and male assistants,	73	
Females, including the wives of the missionaries,	69	148
Stations,		35
Churches organized,		13
Schools,	about	150
Pupils,	about	7,500

[*To be continued.*]

Ordinations and Installations.

December 1,—Rev. Benjamin F. Staunton was ordained over the Congregational Church in Bethlem, Con. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Griswold of Watertown.

December 6,—Rev. John Chambers was ordained at New-Haven, Con. to the work of the Ministry. Sermon by Prof. Fitch, of Yale College.

Jan. 4,—Rev. Charles Fitch was installed Pastor of the Church in Holliston, Mass. Rev. David Long, of Milford, made the introductory prayer; Rev. B. B. Wisner, of Boston, preached the sermon; Rev. Nathaniel Howe, of Hopkinton, made the installing prayer; Rev. Dr. Saunders, of Medfield, gave the charge; Rev.

Mr. Ide, of Medway, gave the right hand of fellowship; Rev. Mr. Noyes, of Needham, made an address to the people; and Rev. Mr. Wood, of Upton, made the concluding prayer.—*Communicated.*

Jan. 4,—Rev. HARLEY GOODWIN was ordained in New-Marlborough, North Parish, as Colleague Pastor withRev. Dr. Catlin. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Yale, of New-Hartford, Con.

Jan. 6,—Rev. ROYAL WASHBURN was installed Pastor of the First Church in Amherst, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Stuart.

Jan. 11,—Rev. JOSHUA BARRET was ordained Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Plymouth, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Enoch Pratt, of Barnstable.

Jan. 18,—Rev. ERASTUS MALTBY was installed Pastor of the Trinitarian Church in Taunton, Mass.; and on the same occasion Rev. GEORGE COWLES was orcained as an Evangelist. Introductory prayer by Rev. Luther Sheldon, of Easton; sermon by Rev. B. B. Wisner, of Boston; consecrating prayer by Rev. Elisha Fisk, of Wrentham; charge by Rev. Thomas Andros, of Berkley; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Daniel Huntington, of North Bridgewater, and the concluding prayer by Rev. Calvin Hitchcock, of Randolph.—*Communicated.*

Poetry.

From the Tract Magazine.

IMPORTANT PRECEPTS.

Whatever else your mind pursues—
To comfort, edify, amuse,
And save from error—daily choose
"TO SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES." *John* v. 39. 2 *Tim.* iii. 15, 16.

In every state temptations rise:
Delusive arts the Serpent tries.—
Hark! Wisdom's voice distinctly cries,
"BE EVER WATCHFUL." *Mat.* xxiv. 42. *Eph.* v. 15.

Would you o'er sin the conquest gain,
And to the Saviour's love attain,
Nor let a hostile thought remain;
"LIVE MUCH IN PRAYER." *Luke* xviii. 1. 1 *Thes.* v. 17.

Should worldly prospects, vast and fair,
Or creature love, your heart ensnare;
Deep rooted in your bosom bear
"THE THOUGHTS OF DYING." *Heb.* ix. 27. 1 *Cor.* vii. 29, 30, 31.

Ye Pilgrims, passing tow'rd your home—
Ye mortals, verging to the tomb,
Not knowing when your Lord may come;
"BE ALWAYS READY." *Heb.* xi. 13, 14. *Mat.* xxiv. 44 & xxv. 10

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. MARCH, 1826. No. 3.

For the Christian Magazine.

ON DIVINATION.

Concluded from page 39.

THIS subject, as illustrated in a preceding paper, naturally suggests several remarks, which are of a practical nature and merit a serious consideration.

It appears from the nature of divination, that it never implied any league or covenant with evil spirits. It is often supposed, that all, who practise any species of divination, must have made a league or covenant with some invisible evil spirit, in order to gain his peculiar favour and assistance, either to foretell future events, or to produce strange and supernatural effects. But if we have given a just and scriptural account of divination, it does not require the peculiar assistance of any evil invisible hand. Men might make arbitrary signs, and perform arbitrary rites or ceremonies, without assistance from the great diviner. They might be diviners, soothsayers, magicians, and wizards, without any league with Satan, or assistance from him. But could any deal with familiar spirits, without some league or covenant with them? Undoubtedly they could. All diviners were of the same character, and those who dealt with familiar spirits were only a different species of diviners. Magicians, enchanters, and dealers with familiar spirits, differed from other diviners only by using more dark and secret rites or enchantments. But all their rites and enchantments were, at bottom, only arbitrary *signs*, words, or actions, which they devised and adopted, without any aid, direction, or assistance of any malignant spirit. According to the scripture account of divination, it was a plain, foolish, wicked practice. It consisted in making arbitrary signs, and performing arbitrary rites and ceremonies, which any one could do that was foolish and wicked enough to undertake it. It required no superior knowledge, nor foreign assistance. The notion, therefore, of leagues and covenants with Satan, and of his special aid and assistance to any species of diviners, is entirely groundless. It seems to have arisen from what such deluded persons pretended; and they made such delusive pretensions to excite admiration, and lead men to expect more from them, than they were able to perform. But there are two considerations, which ought to put this matter beyond a doubt. One is, that the scripture is wholly silent, in respect to diabolical leagues and covenants.

Though it says much concerning divination, and those who practised it, yet it says nothing about their making leagues with evil spirits in order to obtain their invisible influence and assistance, which is strange, if such leagues were known, or even pretended. The other consideration is, that reason forbids the supposition. Reason tells us, that the Devil has no power to lend his aid to any, who should make a league with him. For he has no power to do supernatural things, by virtue of a common providence; for if he had, he would doubtless do ten thousand times more mischief in the world, than he actually does. If he were restrained by moral motives only, as wicked men are, it would be but a small restraint. If wicked men could act invisibly, what enormities would they not commit? But Satan, we know, can act invisibly in this world, and therefore he must be under some *natural* as well as moral restraint. And this natural restraint must hinder him from acting *with*, as well as *without*, a league; for whatever he cannot do *without* a league, he cannot do with a league. If he cannot assist diviners without a league, he cannot assist them with a league. Besides, no pretenders to divination have ever done so much mischief in the world as they would have done, if they had actually obtained an invisible and powerful influence from Satan. The king of Babylon did not so much evil in the world as he would have done, if he had secured and obtained the invisible and powerful assistance of the prince of devils. With such aid, he might have conquered any, or every nation he pleased. The Romans freely practised divination and consulted invisible spirits; but we have no account, that they ever gained a single victory by it. And all the benefit that witches, wizards, and fortune-tellers have ever gained by their pretended art, they have gained from the hands of those whom they deluded, and not by any foreign, invisible power, to take and conceal the property of others, for their own use.

We perceive from the nature of divination, that the *evidence* of it is as plain and intelligible as the evidence of any other crime. The evidence of it consists in what the pretenders of the secret art, do, and profess to do. They do make signs and cast figuers, by which they profess to foretell events, and produce effects. Whoever, therefore, makes and observes arbitrary signs, and professes to divine by them, is a diviner, sooth-sayer, magician, or dealer with familiar spirits, in a scriptural sense. The king of Babylon was a diviner; and the evidence of it was as plain and intelligible as the evidence of his being a general. He stood at the parting of the ways, took his arrows, and divined by them. What he did, and professed to do, was the evidence of his being a diviner. Balaam was a magician or diviner, and this appeared from what he did and said. He used enchantments, and attempted to curse Israel. The evidence against the witch of Endor was of the same nature. It arose from what she did and said. And this is the evidence we have of any crime. The evidence of murder arises from what it appears a man has said and done. As any crime consists in the intention and exertion of any agent; so the evidence of the crime, must

arise from what is seen and known of the intention and exertion of the agent. Hence,

It appears from what has been advanced on this subject, that both Europeans and Americans have gone upon very fallible evidence, in condemning persons for any species of divination; and in particular, witchcraft. The accusers were allowed to be witnesses, and all they knew was the *effect* felt. They complained, that certain persons *hurt* them; but they could not tell what they did to *hurt* them. The effect they *felt* was no certain evidence of bad intentions in those whom they supposed hurt them. Suppose a certain person, by barely *looking* upon others, should give them pain, or throw them into fits; how could that person be fairly condemned for the *effect* of his looking, unless looking at others, be deemed, in itself considered, a crime? Why should it not be supposed, that the *person looking*, is as *passive*, as the *person looked upon?* And why should it not be supposed, that *he* was as innocent, as *they?* Many instances are related of persons being thrown into pain, or fits, by the mere presence of another person. But that person, perhaps, could no more help his presence giving pain, or convulsions to others, than they could help feeling such effects from his presence. It is absurd, therefore, to condemn a person for any *supposed effects* he produces, without knowing what he *does* to produce them. If he is to be condemned, it is for what he is seen or known to do. If he is seen, or known to do any thing bad, he is criminal and ought to be condemned. But those who are troubled with witches, never pretend to tell what they *do*, but only what they themselves *feel*. Such testimony is not valid, and ought not to be acted upon. But those who have had the power of life and death, have acted upon such evidence, and probably in not a few instances condemned the *innocent*.

It appears from the nature of divination, that there is nothing in it, for which we ought to put persons to death at this day, though it were proved against them. If any man will make arbitrary signs, and perform arbitrary ceremonies, and pretend to foretell future events, or to produce extraordinary effects, what then? Why then he is a foolish and trifling creature, and hurts none but those who hearken to his folly. Suppose a man should do as the king of Babylon did, when he came to the parting of the ways, and should set up his staff, and see to which road it inclined, and take the road to which it inclined; would he deserve to die? It is true, the Mosaic law did forbid every species of divination; but that law is not binding upon us, any more than the law against idolatry, sowing divers sorts of seeds, wearing woollen and linen garments, or eating certain sorts of beasts, birds, and fishes. These laws were designed to preserve the Jews as a people distinct and separate from all other nations. But though divination be not a capital crime at this day, yet it is a very heinous sin, whether practised by Jews, or Gentiles. For,

It is evident from what has been said, that all sorts of diviners were impostors. They never could foretell future events, or produce any truly miraculous effects. Moses completely defeated the magicians of Egypt and exposed their imposture. Though they produced strange and extra-

ordinary effects; yet they could not work one real miracle, and were constrained to acknowledge, that they could not do that by their enchantments, which Moses did by the finger of God. Elijah also, who challenged the idolatrous diviners to work a miracle, completely defeated all their exertions, and wrought a miracle that confounded their false pretentions, in the view of a vast multitude of spectators. The magicians could not interpret Pharaoh's dreams, nor tell what Nebuchadnezzar had dreamed. But if their imposture had not been exposed, we might know from reason and scripture, that they were impostors. None but God, who knows his own designs, can possibly foreknow and foretell what events are to take place in future. He accordingly challanges all pretenders to divination, to make good their pretensions, by foretelling what he has not revealed. "Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring forth, and shew us what shall happen. Let them shew the former things what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them, or *declare to us things to come.* Shew the things that are to come hereafter, *that we may know that ye are gods.*" It is presumption in any created being to pretend to know any thing of futurity, which God has not revealed. It is virtually making himself equal to God. Were it true, though it is not, that diviners do make a league with evil spirits, who promise them assistance to foretell future events; yet they cannot fulfil their promise, for they are profoundly ignorant of every thing which God has not revealed. All diviners, therefore, are vile impostors, and extremely criminal, not only for seeking diabolical assistance, but for pretending to possess it.

From the nature of divination it is apparent, that men have no right to apply to diviners, soothsayers, or fortune-tellers, to discover any object that is lost, or to foretell any thing in future. It is contrary to both reason and scripture to seek to know what none but God can tell. All the predictions of impostors are only conjectures, which are totally destitute of certainty. Though they may and sometimes do conjecture right; yet they employ forbidden means to pry into futurity, and they stand condemned by God, whether they do, or do not think they possess diabolical assistance. God may overrule their arbitrary signs, to foretell some future events, or to discover some unknown objects, often enough to deceive both themselves and those who apply to them; yet this neither exculpates them, nor those who seek to them and place confidence in them. It is extreme folly in those, who do not believe that they have any intercourse with, or derive any knowledge or assistance from invisible spirits, to apply to them; and it is extremely criminal in those, who do believe that they are assisted by a diabolical influence, to apply to them, for they are partakers in the guilt of the impostors to whom they apply, and exposed to run into all their errors and delusions.

The account which we have given of divination, authorizes the assertion, that all modes of trying fortunes, whether by books, or by lots, or by cards, or by cups, are very criminal and dangerous. All these modes of trying fortunes

partake of the nature of divination, which is contrary to scripture and reason. To divine by the Bible, as we have observed, is an abuse of that sacred Book, which reveals all that we need to know respecting our conduct, our character, and our condition, for time and eternity, without the aid of divination. To divine by the casting of lots, is a presumptuous appeal to God to decide what he does not mean to decide by his common providence. He did, indeed, permit some persons, under the Old Testament, to appeal to him by lot, on some important and extraordinary occasions; but he has given no such permission to Christians under the New Testament; and therefore they have no right to appeal to him by lot to decide any case. All publick as well as private lotteries are unreasonable, unscriptural, and criminal, whether approved by parental, or legislative authority. They are no less pernicious in their tendency, than criminal in their nature. They have often ruined both the fortunate and unfortunate, who have been concerned in them. Those may expect to be frowned upon, who tempt the Lord their God, by appealing to him without his permission. To play cards, either for wagers, or amusement, is totally wrong, because it implies a *lot*, which is an unpermitted and presumptuous appeal to God. But to divine by them, is still more criminal. It is a species of divination, which ought to be universally despised and condemned. Nor can divining by *cups* be justified. Though it seems to be a very trifling matter to count, observe, and give significancy to little specks and dots, yet it is of the same nature, and discovers the same undue desire to pry into the secrets of futurity, as the more serious and important modes of divination, and is as really displeasing to God, who has forbidden the practice in every form. But do not some or other of these heathenish modes of divination prevail here, in this land of Gospel Light? By which, the Bible is profaned, the Sabbath is profaned, time, talents, and property are abused, religion is neglected, and error, superstition, and vice are sanctioned and promoted. It highly concerns parents, guardians, and all men of power and influence, to condemn, prevent, and suppress all such evil practices as have been mentioned; and especially card playing, which is a most fruitful source of almost every other vice. To neglect suppressing these evils, is to partake in the guilt of them; and very likely, to share in the punishment of them. The neglect of one, will not excuse the neglect of another, in respect to this important duty.

Another remark suggested by this subject is, that mankind are naturally enemies to God. They have always been disposed to forget and forsake their Creator, and to bow down and worship some false and inferior deity. God's people of old were so addicted to idolatry, that the strictest laws he made, and the severest punishments he threatened, were insufficient to restrain them from it. If the hearts of men were naturally right with God, they would naturally love his character and rejoice in his government. But they have, by nature, a carnal mind, which is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; and this leads them to love and serve any other god, rather than

the true God. Though gross idolatry is avoided in this country; yet more refined and reputable idolatry is almost universally practised, in some way or other. Numerous modes and forms of prying into futurity are invented and pursued, which discover a disposition to foretell and defeat the purposes of God, which he has not revealed. They distrust the infinite wisdom and goodness of God in the government of the world, and place greater confidence in the wisdom and goodness of his most blind and inveterate enemies. No person was ever anxious to foreknow future events, which God has not revealed, without distrusting divine providence, and being disposed to obstruct the operations of it. It is practically saying to God, "We will not have thee to reign over us." Thousands, who will not own that they ever hated God, cannot deny that they have murmured under his government, and have used means, and perhaps, employed others to use means, to obstruct or evade the divine purposes. Their own hearts, therefore, testify against them, and pronounce them enemies to God, who would, if they could, flee out of his hands.

We may justly conclude from what has been said, that there is great reason to rejoice, that the Lord reigns in the kingdoms of nature, providence, and grace. He is able and disposed to do what is wisest and best, in respect to every creature and every event in the universe. He has reserved times, and seasons, and events in his power, and will not suffer any thing to be done, or any event to take place, which he will not overrule for his own glory, and the good of his friends and faithful servants. This ought to give joy and satisfaction to all mankind, and restrain them from all murmurings and complaints under his government, and all undue measures to *extort* from him that knowledge of futurity, which he has wisely and mercifully concealed from them. He has revealed as much as can do them any good, and concealed only what would be detrimental to them. Mankind are always disposed to abuse the knowledge of futurity, which God reveals to them. He foretold several thousand years ago, that Canaan the son of Ham should be a servant of servants; and from this prediction whole nations have concluded, that they had a right to enslave the Africans. God foretold to Hazael, that he should be king of Israel, which led him to slay his master and usurp his throne. It is a great mercy to this depraved and restless world, that God has concealed so much of futurity from them, and restrained them from ten thousand errors and evils, which they would bring upon themselves, if they could, by any means, penetrate his secret counsels.

Finally, this subject exhorts all to place a cordial and unshaken confidence in God, the supreme disposer of all events. There is perfect safety in trusting in the Lord Jehovah, in whom is everlasting strength. He will keep them in perfect peace, who trust in him. He will constantly employ all his perfections to promote his own glory, which will necessarily promote their holiness and happiness, through every period of their existence. There is but one alternative before you. You must either trust in God, or in lying vanities which cannot profit. You are weak and dependent creatures, and un-

der an absolute necessity of placing your trust in God, or in yourselves, or your frail impotent fellow creatures. Why should you halt between two opinions? If the Lord be God, trust in him, and him alone.

For the Christian Magazine.

EXTRACTS FROM THE JOURNAL OF MRS. MARY C. ATKINSON.

In the year 1822, several persons in the East Parish of Attleborough, Mass. gave satisfactory evidence of being renewed by the influence of the Holy Spirit. Among them was a young lady, nineteen years of age, of an amiable disposition, a cultivated mind, and peculiarly interesting in her deportment. She was a daughter of the late Deac. Chase Moulton of Rehoboth. From early childhood she had enjoyed the advantages of religious instruction and pious example; and was, previously to her hopeful conversion, moral and exemplary. When however the Holy Spirit convinced her of sin, she was far from being satisfied with her own character. She was deeply sensible that her morality was consistent with a total alienation of heart and life from God; and when humbled before him, she cast herself as the chief of sinners, on his distinguishing mercy. We received her into the communion and fellowship of the church, with more than usual satisfaction and confidence; and many of us rejoiced in the hope that God would make her a lasting blessing to the church in this place, especially to our youth. But the Lord's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts.

In the month of May she was received into the church. In June, she was married to Samuel Atkinson Esq. of Chillicothe, Ohio. In three or four months from the time of making a profession of religion, she left us for a distant part of the country; and in less than two years, she was removed from the church militant, to join, as we have reason to hope, the church triumphant.

From the time of her conversion, till within a few months of her death, she kept a journal, in which are related various exercises of her mind. From that journal, which was found among her papers after her decease, the following extracts are made, with the hope, that though dead, she may speak for the benefit of the living.

"Attleborough, April 6, 1822.

Almost nineteen years have rolled away since I first saw the light; but O, how little have I done for the glory of my Maker. The death of the best of fathers, an affectionate brother and a beloved sister, were solemn warnings to me to prepare to meet my God. But instead of profiting by these repeated and great afflictions, I had hard and presumptuous thoughts of the God of all grace. Thus I went on, adding sin to sin, apparently ripening fast for destruction. Although blest with the best of religious instruction, yet I had become an infidel in theory as well as in practice; and had long in my heart denied the existence of God. But the first of last month, I was brought to realize that I was in the hands of a sin-hating, sin-avenging God. And through his infinite mercy, I humbly trust, that I became reconciled to him, and could say from my heart, 'thy will be done.' Since that time, my views and feelings have been very different from what they

were formerly; and I think, religion is now my chief joy. O may I not be deceived; but be prepared by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to spend an eternity in the society of angels and just men made perfect, singing praises to God for ever and ever."

"April 12. For some time, I have entertained a hope, that I had passed from death unto life; but am I not building upon a sandy foundation? I find so much selfishness remaining in my heart, that I am afraid my motives are all mercenary. May I realize the awful danger of self-deception. I can have no excuse for such criminal conduct, for I have every opportunity, which I can possibly desire, to know on which side I am; and if I should now rest upon a false hope, how great will be my condemnation!"

"April 18. Should I live to the age of man, how short will be the time compared to eternity! But I know not, that I shall live a year, a month, or even a day. And am I prepared for that solemn change, which I must sooner or later experience? Am I prepared to stand before the awful bar of God and be judged according to the deeds done in the body? Am I prepared to submit willingly to the divine will, even in accepting the just punishment of my sins? Do I love God supremely?

'Tis a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought;
Do I love the Lord or no?
Am I his or am I not?
Lord decide the doubtful case.'"

"April 19. How little are my affections weaned from this vain world. I wish to view all things here below, just as I shall when laid upon the bed of death. How vain, how worthless, will many things appear to me then, on which I now set a high value. I wish to give myself wholly and unreservedly to God,—to make his glory my only aim; but how much cause have I to humble myself in the dust, when I consider how little I do that is worthy a rational and immortal being. Assist me, O God, I beseech thee, to give myself wholly to thee—to dedicate my life to thy service; and if the favour is not too great for such a wicked, hell-deserving wretch to ask or even hope for, O grant that I may spend an eternity in thy presence."

"April 20. Another week is gone and numbered with the years beyond the flood. And now, O my soul, what improvement hast thou made? Have I not added largely to the long catalogue of my crimes, by the cold and formal performance of my duties?

'If I turn my eyes within,
All is vain and dark and wild;
Filled with unbelief and sin,
Can I deem myself a child?'

To-morrow I shall be propounded to the church; but how little do I deserve the privilege of uniting with a church of Christ? Am I not utterly unworthy to meet with true believers at the table of the Lord? O thou great Jehovah, who knowest the iniquity of my heart, thou, from whom nothing is concealed, grant, if I am indeed destitute of grace, that I may not pollute a visible church of thine."

"April 28. The weather being stormy, I could not attend public worship. When I recollect how many sabbaths I have voluntarily absented myself from the house of God, I am astonished that this great and invaluable privilege is not wholly denied me. How of-

ten has this holy day hung heavily on my hands and every expedient, which was not utterly inconsistent with decency, been resorted to, to pass away the time? I am an astonishing instance of the long suffering and patience of the most high God. How much cause for the deepest self-abasement? What would be great humility in another, would be presumption in me. I will then strive to take my proper place. I will endeavour to give God all the glory, and take shame and confusion of face to myself. And wilt thou, eternal Jehovah, condescend to assist a poor, feeble worm of the dust? Without thee I can do nothing."

"April 29. Awoke in a good frame this morning. The first words which occurred to my mind were, 'Why should a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins.' May I never forget them. Determined to spend this week in preparation for the solemn duties, which I shall soon perform, if accepted by the church. May I do this in singleness of heart, looking constantly to God for direction. Formed a resolution this morning, never to shut my eyes to sleep, without considering the possibility of soon sleeping the sleep of death, and examining my heart to see, if I am prepared to exchange worlds."

"May 19. Sabbath morning. Since writing the above, I have passed through a very solemn and interesting scene. I have given myself to the most high God, by a public profession; promising, with his grace assisting me, to walk in every respect as becomes a disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, and have commemorated his dying love with the dear saints around his board.

'Tis done, the great transaction's done;
I am the Lord's and he is mine.
He drew me and I followed on,
Charmed to confess the voice divine.
Now rest my long divided heart;
On this delightful centre rest.
With ashes who would grudge to part,
When called on angels bread to feast.'"

"May 25. Saturday evening. How sweet, how solemn the commencement of the Sabbath?

'Day of all the days the best,
Emblem of eternal rest.'

Who can sufficiently prize the privilege of being placed in a land of gospel light and liberty? God would have been perfectly just, had he placed me in a land where Sabbaths and sanctuary privileges are unknown. Millions of my fellow beings, equally deserving, are overshadowed with the dark mists of paganism. But if these precious privileges, with which I am surrounded, be misimproved, how greatly will they add to my condemnation. May this consideration quicken me, that I may make my calling and election sure; and may I, while imploring mercy for myself, never forget to pray for those, who bow the knee to vain idols—who know not the true God."

"May 26. All thy works praise thee, O God, and shall man be silent? Oh no. Let this day be witness to our adorations. Let thy saints worship before thee in the spirit of holiness. May it be a day long to be remembered, as one of great refreshing from thy presence."

"June 8. I am brought to the close of another week. A few more weeks and I shall probably be a stranger in a strange land. I shall quit the place of my na-

tivity, and the dear parent who has watched over my helpless years and been the guide of my youth. I shall give her many a pang, who has felt and still feels all a mother's tenderness for me. Can it be right to leave her? Is it consistent with the duty, I owe my dear mother? If I know my own heart, it is my fervent desire to act in this important matter, as I shall wish I had done, when I shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ. If I have been actuated by improper motives, Oh do thou, who hast all things at thy disposal, place insuperable difficulties in the way, that my contemplated removal may never be effected.

"Chillicothe, Ohio, *Aug.* 30.

"Since writing the above, I have passed through a variety of scenes; in all of which I have to acknowledge the unmerited goodness of God. His guardian hand has been constantly extended over me and preserved me from every danger. I have entered into the marriage covenant with one, for whose sake, I have left my dear mother, brothers and sister, and all the affectionate friends and companions of my youthful days, and am in a land of strangers. But, although I am separated from many my heart holds dear, yet I have much, very much, to be thankful for. I have a husband who is all that I could wish or expect, and there are those to whom, a short time since I was a stranger, that I already respect and esteem.

I am now in a very responsible situation; not only a wife; but a step-mother. A dear little one is dependant on me for all that care and attention which a mother can bestow. And shall I be able to discharge these important duties? O no; of myself I am insufficient, I am daily convinced of it. But there is one who is able to give me all that assistance which I so much need. And I have his blessed promise that I shall receive it, if I rely on him with due submission to his holy will and pleasure."

"Jan. 5, 1823. I have to-day formed a solemn resolution to shake off this spirit of discontent which so easily besets me; and, by the grace of God assisting me, to renounce the things of this vain world and live in some degree to his glory. O that I may receive strength from above to keep this resolution. Heavenly Father, I cast myself upon thy mercy; graciously grant me thy assistance. Enable me in all circumstances and in all situations, to cast my burden upon thee; and to say from the heart, 'Not my will but thine be done.'"

"Feb. 4. I am grieved that I have broken the resolution I so solemnly made. Though a great part of the time depressed by melancholy, yet God is still showering down blessings upon me. He has graciously condescended to prolong my life, to preserve my health, and to give me many opportunities for secret prayer, which, vile as I am, I prize above all price."

"March 6. A year to-day since I first entertained a hope of being one of those whose sins are washed in the blood of the Lamb. Never shall I forget what I then felt. It was not that joy, which most persons express, when the light of God's countenance first beams upon the soul; but it was a sweet peace, which I cannot describe. But was it a real work of grace upon the heart, or was it a delusion from the wicked one, to lay my conscience asleep, that

he might secure me as his prey? My life since that time seems to say the last was the case; but still I hope. Though I have backslidden far, very far, I cannot think I am deceived. A great part of the time, I am groping in thick darkness; yet there are times, when I think I can say, with Thomas, 'My Lord and my God.' Blessed moments! O may I like Noah's dove find no rest for the sole of my foot, when away from the ark of safety. May I never rest, when I cannot enjoy communion with God. But stop; is it, can it be possible that the most high God stoops to hold communion with a worm of the dust, who has broken his laws and abused his mercy? Yes, it is possible; we are assured of it in his blessed word. Sing praises unto God, O my soul, for this great and astonishing favour. O sing praises."

"March 11. O my soul, what provision art thou making for that eternity to which thou art hastening? Time is short. Death stands ready to dissolve thy partnership with this frail body. Soon, very soon, thou must stand before the awful bar of God and answer for the deeds thou hast done and art now doing. Nothing will be forgotten in that solemn dreadful day. It will not then avail thee, that thou hast made a solemn profession of love to God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. God looks at the heart, and if thou hast only a name to live and art dead, he will say unto thee, 'I never knew thee, depart from me thou cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' O let this arouse thee from the awful state of stupidity into which thou art fallen."

"March 30. Again am I permitted to behold the light of another of the days of the Son of man.

'Welcome sweet day of rest,
That saw the Lord arise;
Welcome to this reviving breast,
And these rejoicing eyes.'

The weather is so unpleasant that I cannot attend public worship. But shall this blessed day hang heavily on my hands? The word of God is open before me, and shall I not partake of the rich feast which it offers to my fainting soul? How many of my fellow mortals are perishing for this food with which I am so abundantly supplied? To what am I to ascribe this? Is it to any work of righteousness that I have done? O no; I have gone astray ever since I was born, speaking lies. My heart is harder than the nether millstone; callous alike to mercies and judgments. I have broken the law of God and trampled upon his statutes, and it is because he is God and not man that I am not consumed. And what shall I render to thee, O my God, for thy long suffering and compassion? Thy word answers me, love God supremely and thy neighbour as thyself."

"April 6. A year to-day since I commenced this Journal. In reviewing it, I find no evidence of growth in grace. God has dealt bountifully with me in all things; but I am unthankful. I have done many things which I ought not to have done; and shamefully neglected many more which I knew it was my duty to do. Conscience loudly calls on me to improve the present moment and repent before it is for ever too late. O may I now begin a new life; and if my life is spared through the coming year, may

these pages bear witness that old things are passed away, and that all things are become new."

"June 11. I have this day called on Mrs. S. for the express purpose of telling her the state of my mind, and begging her advice and counsel. She is an experienced, lively christian, capable of directing me in the way in which I ought to go. But how shall I record that criminal backwardness which prevented me from mentioning the subject? In vain I strove to turn the course of conversation from other subjects. I could not bring myself to express the cause of my coming, freely and frankly, as I ought to have done. Is it possible that I am ashamed of Christ and his cause?"

"June 12. 'As for man, his days are as grass. As the flower of the field he flourisheth; the wind passeth over it and it is gone, and the place thereof is remembered no more.' Striking picture of human frailty. A few short days and the hurry and bustle of life are ended. Our bodies rest in the silent mansion of the dead; but, O our souls! they must enter upon a new and untried state. Lives there the man who can contemplate this awful scene with composure? Yes, blessed be God, there are many who look forward to the day in which they shall pass the dark valley of the shadow of death with joy. They view it as the day in which they shall meet a sweet release from all their troubles. Above all, they will then be released from the dominion of sin and be admitted into the presence of their God, where is fulness of joy for evermore.

"Sept. 1. Sabbath morning. The sacrament of the Lord's supper will this day be administered to the church of which I am now a member. It is a long time since I enjoyed the privilege of uniting with the dear saints in commemorating the dying love of the Lord of glory. 'Do this in remembrance of me,' was his dying command, to all who through repentance are made partakers of the redemption purchased with his blood. I have long thought the ordinance was denied me, because I was not worthy of receiving the blessed privilege. My life is dreadful, my sins are as mountains. If nothing interposes to-day, to prevent my taking a seat with the followers of the Lamb, will it, can it be my duty? I would give worlds for a Christian friend who would advise me. The two last sacraments appeared to be withheld by the immediate hand of God. It was my earnest desire that they might be, if I should, by coming to the table, dishonour my dear Redeemer. And O God, wilt thou, to whom all things are known, and who hast all things at thy control, still withhold this privilege, if my name is not written among the followers of the Lamb. O let me not pollute thy table, with my unhallowed presence, if I am sold under sin. But, O God, wilt thou greatly bless all those who are worthy and who shall this day assemble around thy board. May they be greatly refreshed by the living food of which they shall partake; and wilt thou fill them with great peace and joy from on high. And wilt thou too remember sinners in Zion with mercy and compassion. Cause them to repent of their sins and turn unto the Lord, before it be forever too late. Look, heavenly Father, with tender mercy on my dear husband. O that thou wouldst give him a new heart and renew a right spirit within him. Let me not,

O God, be a stumbling block in his way. If it can be consistent with thy holy will, let us both live to promote the cause of the dear Redeemer. Even so, Amen."

Thus closed her Journal: and whoever shall attentively remark the change which it indicates in the mind of the author, will perhaps discover an interesting sense of her own unworthiness; and an interested engagedness for the salvation of others. And these are traits, illustrative of christian character. The christian knows more of the evil of sin and of the plague of his own heart than others; he is therefore disposed to speak of himself in terms of abasement and self-loathing. But, reader, do not thence conclude, that he is further from true happiness and enjoyment than other men. If any unregenerate person, shall read this journal, let him inquire, whether he ever had peace and joy, like that which the writer experienced. Do you ask, What was the foundation of her joy? It was God: Loving him supremely, she could hate and abhor her own character, and yet be happy, because her happiness did not flow from the views which she had of herself; but from the views which she had of her God. Soon after recording the last entry in her journal, she was taken sick with the fever of the country. From this attack she never entirely recovered. Her feeble frame was unable to endure the trial which yet awaited her, and on the seventh day of February 1824, she fell asleep, we trust in Jesus, to be for ever with him in glory. Her last illness was short and distressing. Two days before her death, she became very much distressed in view of her sinfulness and stupidity; she thought she did not realize her own guiltiness before God as she ought. She remained in this state of mind until the evening before she died, when she observed to those, who waited upon her, that she had enjoyed some moments of relief and happiness, and very soon, to use the language of her husband, 'she became the most composed and happy being I ever saw.' Her physicians had requested that she might be kept as quiet as possible; but it was with great regret, she said, that she was prevented from talking as much as she pleased. It was the last opportunity she should ever enjoy of warning those around her.—The lowest place in heaven was all she desired or expected, and even that was infinitely more than she felt that she deserved. Thus, in the 21st year of her age, died this interesting and pious lady.

Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord.

Attleborough, Feb. 1826.

For the Christian Magazine.

SIN—NOT A PUNISHMENT.

Is not a sin a punishment, since the subject of it must be miserable, according to the divine constitution or nature of things?

I am disposed to answer this question in the negative. For,

1. If sin be a punishment, then punishment and the desert of punishment are the same; which is absurd. Desert of punishment, is as distinct from punishment, as a cause is from its effect. As a cause must exist anterior to its effect, so the desert of punishment must exist anterior to punishment, or else it is unjust. Could God have punished Adam before he deserved punishment? Could he have deserved it before he

And it can be owing to nothing but criminal stupidity, or infidelity, that any overlook the hand of God, in what they suffer or enjoy. The prophet reproves Belshazzar for disregarding the care, protection and goodness of his Creator. "The God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified." Whether men are rich or poor, whether they are prosperous, or unprosperous; whether they are in health or sickness; whether their friends, relatives and connexions are spared or taken away, they ought to acknowledge the hand of God in all his dispensations towards them. And this acknowledgment implies something more than a mere speculative belief, that all the good and evil that falls to their lot, comes through the overruling hand of God. Multitudes are willing to say in words, and they believe what they say, that God governs the world and directs all events, prosperous and adverse; and yet neither realize nor love this most interesting truth. They feel and act, rejoice or mourn, hope or fear, as though God were not in all their thoughts. But Job realized and approved of the divine agency under his afflictions. He felt and enjoyed this consoling and humiliating truth. He said, "Shall we receive *good* at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive *evil?* And again he said, "Though he slay me yet will I trust in him." He felt himself to be in the hands of God, as clay is in the hands of the potter. And thus it becomes all men to acknowledge, with deep sensibility, that it is God who gives or takes away their comforts and enjoyments, and who raises them up, or casts them down by his holy and sovereign hand. Nor is this all. For,

II. They ought to *bless*, as well as acknowledge God, under both the smiles and frowns of his providence. Job acknowledged, that God had given and taken away, and then adds what is still more important, "Blessed be the name of the Lord." He blessed God in taking away, as well as in granting his favours, though the taking away was extremely distressing and painful. And in this it is said "he sinned not," but felt and conducted right. He ought to have blessed God under both the smiles and frowns of his providence. And what was his duty in his situation, is the duty of the bereaved and afflicted, in all other similar cases. For,

1. God never takes away any favours from mankind, but what he meant to take away when he gave them. It is true, he does not inform the subjects of his mercies, how *long* he intends to continue, or how *soon* he intends to take away his favours; but he always determines in his own mind, before he bestows any blessing, how long that blessing shall continue, and whether it shall or shall not be removed during life. As he always has some purpose to answer by every good gift, so when that good gift has answered the purpose for which it was given, he takes it away, and not before. So that he acts from the same benevolent motive in taking away, as in bestowing his favours. Could we see his motives in giving, we could see his motives in taking away; and of course, could see the same goodness in taking away as in giving. He never bestows the least favour upon any individual of the human race, without weighing

the consequences of giving; nor, if he means to take it away, without weighing the consequences of taking it away. He always gives and takes away after the counsel of his own will, or his original designs, which, like himself, are perfectly holy, just, and good. If mankind have reason to bless God for giving, in any instance, they have the same reason to bless him for taking away what he has given. This is always true in respect to God, though not always true in respect to men. They may have better motives in giving than in taking away. They may give in kindness, but take away in unkindness. But the kind parent of the universe never treats his creatures so. He gives and takes away from precisely the same benevolent motives. And this is a good reason why mankind should bless him under both the smiles and frowns of his providence.

2. The favours which God continues, are generally more numerous and more important than those he removes. Life itself is paramount to all other earthly favours; for were they all taken away but that, *that* alone would overbalance all the losses and bereavements which could be sustained. Hence the prophet demands, "Wherefore should a *living* man complain?" But God generally spares far more than he takes away, and mingles innumerable mercies with his judgments. The mercies he bestows and continues are clear manifestations of his kindness to the afflicted, and demonstrate that he "does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." If he meant to treat them unkindly, he would strip them of all their comforts and enjoyments. But his mercy always rejoices against judgment, which ought to convince them that he is more ready to give than to take away. This ought to fill their hearts with gratitude, and cause them to bless the Lord at all times. For they always have reason to feel and say, "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, and because his compassions fail not."

3. The afflicted know that whatever personal evils God brings upon *them*, he constantly seeks the general good of the universe, and that all the sufferings they endure, are calculated and designed to answer that wise and benevolent purpose. All personal evils and calamities are intended and suited to promote the general good, whether they do, or do not promote the private, personal good of the sufferers. Job's calamities, which were designed for his good, were no less designed for the benefit of thousands, in all future ages. They have been, are now, and will be, instructive and consoling to multitudes, who have heard, and will hear of his sufferings and patience. Abraham's trial was designed not only for his good, but for the good of the children of Abraham from generation to generation to the end of time. The series of calamities, inflicted on the murmuring Israelites, have answered, and will answer important purposes to the world in general from age to age. God makes use of individuals to teach and to warn the world, by their conduct under his chastising hand. And the afflicted may always consider, that whether they do, or shall receive benefit from their own afflictions, the world certainly will. God is aiming at a good end in afflicting them, and this end he will certainly accomplish, whatever becomes of them. And ought they

not to bless him, for seeking an end which is superior to their personal good, whether *that* be secured or lost by his smiles or frowns upon them? The consideration that God is constantly and ultimately pursuing the highest happiness of the whole intelligent creation, is a weighty reason for blessing and praising him in the darkest seasons, and under the heaviest public or private calamities. The primitive christians esteemed it a privilege to be counted worthy to suffer for the cause of Christ, and the benefit of the world. And why should not men now consider it a privilege to suffer for the good of the world? When God afflicts, or bereaves, he implicitly says to the afflicted or bereaved, do you now teach your fellow-men how to feel and conduct under the evils and calamities of life. Be an example of suffering affliction, and improve the opportunities I give you to promote the best interest of mankind, which is my supreme aim in laying my heavy hand upon you.

4. The afflicted and bereaved have often reason to bless God; because the evils they are suffering are so much lighter than those which many others *have* suffered, and are suffering. They are apt to think and say, "there is no sorrow like unto my sorrow." Let them only look into the scriptures, and read the history of God's conduct towards nations and individuals, and they will see reason to believe, that their own trials and afflictions, and bereavements, are light indeed, when compared with those recorded in the eleventh of Hebrews, and in other parts of the scripture. Or let them look around them, and they can hardly fail to find one and another pressed down with heavier burdens and severer afflictions, than they have been called to endure. And when they see this discrimination in their favour, to what can they ascribe it, but the mere mercy of him who punishes them much less than they deserve? But,

5. There is another reason, why men should always bless God under both the smiles and frowns of his providence, and that is, because this is the only way to make all his dealings with them work together for their good. There is an infallible connexion between their feeling and acting right under divine corrections, and their receiving spiritual and everlasting benefit from them. Abraham, Jacob, and Job derived great spiritual benefit from their singular and severe suffering and bereavements. David found it to be good for him that he had been afflicted. Afflictions, as well as mercies, are suited to promote the spiritual benefit of the subjects of them, if they only wisely and properly improve them. If they are submissive under the *frowns*, as well as thankful under the *smiles* of providence, they express that pure love to God to which the promise is made, "that all things shall work together for their good." The great accuser of the brethren insinuated that Job loved God merely for his favours, and would curse him to his face if he bereaved him of what he had given. Accordingly God put Job's sincerity to the test, and he endured the trial; for he *blessed* God under his frowns as well as under his smiles. And by such a tender, teachable, filial and submissive spirit, he turned the frowns as well as smiles of God to his own present and future good. This then is the way, and the only way of deriving cer-

tain and saving benefit from all the dispensations of providence. Hence it becomes the afflicted and bereaved to *bless* God in their present situation. They have no occasion for prying into the counsels of Heaven, or attempting to comprehend the divine purposes. They have only to be still and wait for the salvation of God. If they bless God, he will bless them. God is doing right, and if they will only feel and do right, he will teach them to profit, by the best means which infinite wisdom and goodness can use with them. Let all the afflicted follow the example and advice of Job. Let them now acquaint themselves with him and be at peace, and thereby good shall come unto them.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER VII.

WHILE the pilgrims were thus engaged in their meditations, near the cross, and giving vent to their various feelings, I observed a man come up to them, in the habit which Evangelist wore, whose name was *Self-conceit*, and with a countenance which expressed some pity, and much contempt, he began,

S. c. Unhappy, deluded men! What do you mean, by looking at that cross with so much emotion? You seem to be full of wild ecstacy, rapture, and enthusiasm.

Ard. I cannot but weep, when I look at that cross, and think of him who died upon it, to make atonement for sin, by the shedding of his blood.

S. c. I pity your ignorance. You are not acquainted with the works of that great and excellent philosopher, the very learned and worthy Doctor Priestley, or you would not entertain the absurd and vulgar idea, that the death of that man made any atonement for sin. He says, "Christ being a man, who suffered and died in the best of causes, there is nothing so very different in the occasion and manner of his death, from that of others, who suffered and died after him, in the same cause of Christianity, but that their sufferings and death may be considered in the same light with his." The death of Paul, or any other martyr, might as well be considered as making atonement for sin. But I want no atonement. My good moral life is all my dependence.

Ard. But, does not Paul speak of Christ as him "in whom we have redemption, *through his blood*, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace?"

S. c. Paul indeed says it; but the same great philosopher has told us that Paul often reasons inconclusively. No doubt Paul said what he thought; but he was in the same mistake that you are.

Th. But this goes to deny the divine authority of the scriptures.

S. c. Yes: the same excellent and worthy Doctor says to one of his correspondents, "Neither I, nor I presume yourself, believe implicitly every thing that is advanced by any writer in the Old or New Testament. I believe all the writers to have been men, and consequently fallible, and liable to mistake." "That the books of scripture were written by particular divine inspiration, is a notion destitute of all proof, and that has done great injury to the evidence of Christianity.

Th. If you reject the doctrine of atonement, and deny the inspi-

ration of the scriptures, I see not why you are not a Deist, and consider him who died on the cross, not as the Lord from heaven, but a vile impostor.

S. c. No; I am not a Deist: I am a Unitarian Christian; that is, a liberal, enlightened, and rational Christian. I venerate him who died on the cross, as a good man, but as nothing more than a man, who had no existence till he was born of Mary. The difference between us and Deists, however, is not great. The same worthy and learned philosopher, in speaking of a man who had been thought a Deist, says, "He is generally considered as an unbeliever: If so, however, he cannot be far from us, and I hope in the way to be not only almost, but altogether what we are." And my very worthy friend, the enlightened and liberal Mr. Cogan, says, "The sincere and conscientious Deist cannot be far from the kingdom of heaven;" in which sentiment I cordially concur.

Th. But if Christ was a good man, he would tell the truth; and he speaks of himself as having come down from heaven, and says, (John, vi. 62,) "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?"

S. c. I know not what to do with this passage, but to deny that Christ ever uttered it. My great master, the aforesaid acute and learned philosopher, did not know what to do with it. He confesses, that, "Though not satisfied with any interpretation of this extraordinary passage, yet rather than believe our Saviour to have existed in any other state before the creation of the world, or to have left some state of great dignity and happiness, when he came hither, he would have recourse to the old and exploded Socinian idea, of Christ's actual ascent into heaven, or of his imagining that he had been carried up thither in a vision; which, like that of St. Paul, he had not been able to distinguish from a reality; nay, he would not build an article of faith of such magnitude on the correctness of John's recollections and representation of our Lord's language; and so strange and incredible does the hypothesis of a pre-existent state appear, that sooner than admit it, he would suppose the whole verse to be an interpolation, or that the old apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another."

Ard. I cannot bear to hear my Lord and Saviour thus degraded. You suppose him, who knew all things, not to be able to tell whether he was in heaven or upon earth!

S. c. He might be a very good man, and yet be ignorant of many things. That truly great and good man, the very learned and worthy Mr. Belsham, says, "The Unitarian doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man, constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties." And to give one instance, I would observe, that he no doubt really thought, that many in his day were possessed with devils; but my great master, Doctor Priestley, has shown that this was a vulgar error of the Jews, and that there are no such beings as devils, those people being only deranged in their intellects.

Th. Did Mr. Belsham think, then, that Christ was a *sinner?* If he was "a man in *all* respects like other men," that seems to be a necessary conclusion.

S. c. We are not fond of using

such harsh language; we prefer softer terms. We call many things infirmities and frailties, which others call sins. We do not like to be so impolite as to call any man a sinner, unless he is grossly vicious. We entertain a very favourable opinion of the goodness of human nature. And Mr. Belsham thinks, that "with few, if any exceptions, there is a very great preponderance of good, in every individual."

Ard. I know too much of my own heart to believe that. I know that in my natural state, "every imagination of the thoughts of my heart was only evil continually." And hence I feel the need of "the washing of regeneration," and of cleansing by the blood of Christ. And whatever you may say, I am resolved to follow the example of the scripture saints in praising and adoring my Lord and Saviour. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, and his Father: To him be glory and dominion, for ever and ever, Amen."

S. c. I must conclude of you, as the very worthy, enlightened, and liberal Mr. Lindsay does of those like you: "There is no reasoning with such persons: they are to be pitied, and considered as being under a delusion of mind." The great and excellent Mr. Belsham says, "Jesus is indeed now alive. But as we are totally ignorant of the place where he resides, and of the occupations in which he is engaged, there can be no proper foundation for religious addresses to him, nor of *gratitude* for favours now received, nor yet of confidence in his future interposition in our behalf."

So the man left them, and went on in the road of the pilgrims; and they soon after walked on also, discoursing together.

Th. That Self-conceit must be ignorant of his own heart, to think he can depend upon his good moral life, and has no need of any atonement for his sins. I could never think of accepting Paul or Moses as my Saviour.

Ard. I feel that I need an Almighty Saviour; and that it would be only insulting my misery to bid me trust in a creature. Those who have any proper sense of the sinfulness of their hearts, cannot be led away by this man.

F. w. I am not disposed to embrace his sentiments respecting the atonement; for I know that Jesus died for my sins, and that I have received pardon through his blood.

Love-s. I can never admit that Christ is a mere creature; for if he had been, his obedience could never be set down to my account. He must have been required to obey for himself.

No-law. And if he had been a man "in *all* respects like other men," his death must have been a punishment for his own sins; and so my sins could not have been all punished in him, which is my only hope.

Th. I do not see how the obedience of Christ to the moral law, can ever be set down to our account. If he had failed of being perfectly conformed to that law, on his own account, it would have been a sin in him. He was tried by the tempter in the wilderness; and if he had complied with his temptations, he would have been a transgressor, and utterly unfit to make atonement for the sin of the world. His obedience to the moral law was perfect, but no more than perfect. It was necessary to qualify

him to make atonement, but did not constitute any part of the atonement itself; for it is written, "It is the blood which maketh atonement for the soul."

No-law. Is it not written also, that "by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous?"

Th. Yes. But that is not what is commonly called his active obedience; that is, his conformity to the moral law; but it was what is called his passive obedience—his obedience to the command of the Father in laying down his life. He says, "No man taketh it from me; but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." It is by his obedience to this commandment, that is, it is by means of his laying down his life, and pouring out his precious blood on the cross, that many are pardoned, or justified from their sins. But his active obedience, or conformity to the moral law was necessary for himself, to qualify him to make atonement by his blood, as a lamb without blemish and without spot.

No-law. I cannot agree with you. You seem to talk like a legalist. You would divide the work of your salvation with Christ. And while he bore the punishment of your sins, you would obey for yourself. You seem to be opposed to salvation by grace.

Th. I am not conscious of feeling any opposition to salvation by grace alone. I believe that the salvation of a sinner is all of grace, from beginning to end. If it is not, I am sure there can be no hope for me. But you will perhaps be more confirmed in your opinion, when I add, that I do not consider the sufferings of Christ as a true and proper punishment for the sins of men.

F. w. Why, brother, how you talk! You are more of an Arminian than I am. Brother No-law calls me a legalist, because I am for works. But I believe that Christ bore the punishment of my sins. Oh, I *know* he did; and I bless him for it.

Th. I think that the punishment, which the law threatened to sin, is eternal death. And Christ did not suffer eternal death: he rose again on the third day.

Love-s. How then can a sinner be exempted from the punishment of his sins? If they are not fully punished in his surety, they must be fully punished in himself.

Th. They must be fully punished in himself, or they must be freely forgiven for Christ's sake. If they are punished, either in himself, or in another, (if that were possible,) there is no room for forgiveness. When a punishment has been fully inflicted, no more is due. But where no punishment is due, there is none to be remitted. The way of salvation by him who died on the cross, is a way of forgiveness. It is written, "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." This forgiveness is granted freely to all that are willing to accept it as a free gift to the ill-deserving. Thus, I think, justification is an act of grace, as well as every other step, in the sinner's salvation.

F. w. Grace! Yes: salvation is all of grace. But it is free grace; that is, free for all, nothing more being done for one than there is for another.

Th. It is free grace, indeed. But it is free, because bestowed freely upon the ill-deserving. Pardon is indeed offered freely to all; but all reject it, and if no-

thing more was done for them, none would ever accept it.

F. w. Oh yes. Nothing more was done for me, than there is for every other man; but I worked for it and got it.

No-law. You are both too legal. You hold to works. I am for grace without works.

By this time, I perceived that they had arrived at the place where Christian saw Simple, Sloth, and Presumption asleep by the road side, and who had been hanged for their crimes, when Christiana and her company passed by. And here they found, on the left side of the road, a considerable village, named *Careless*, inhabited by the posterity of those men who walked in the steps of their fathers. And as they passed along, a man came out to meet them whose name was *Puff*, and invited them to turn aside, and rest themselves a little. And then, said he, you may have an opportunity to hear a sermon from our minister, the most popular preacher in all these parts, Mr. Self-conceit, a very worthy and excellent man, I assure you, and the most agreeable preacher I ever heard.

Ard. I have some knowledge of him already, and I do not wish to hear him.

Puff. You never heard him preach, I suppose; for if you had, you must admire him, and wish to hear him again.

Ard. No, I never heard him preach; but I heard him converse in such a manner as I wish never to hear another.

Puff. You must have provoked him to engage in controversy, I conclude. But he never introduces any controversy in his preaching. He dwells exclusively on "those great truths and precepts, about which there is little contention." He never introduces any of those unintelligible doctrines, about which christians have so often disputed. He thinks it would "perplex, and needlessly perplex, a common congregation, consisting of persons of all ages, capacities, degrees of improvement, and conditions in society." All the inhabitants of our village "will testify, how little he has sought to influence them on the topics of dispute among christians, how little he has laboured to make them partizans, how constantly he has besought them to look with candour on other denominations, and to delight in all the marks which others exhibit of piety and goodness." He "professes to accord with that apostle, who has taught us that charity is greater than faith and hope; more excellent than the tongue of angels, and the understanding of all mysteries." And as a proof of his excellence as a minister, I could mention "the singular prosperity he has enjoyed." "Perhaps in no part of the world is the condition of ministers more favoured than his. Whilst he receives nothing of a superstitious homage, or a blind submission, he finds himself respected by all classes of society, and, I may say, distinguished by the eminent, the enlightened and the good." "In our society there are no divisions, no jealousies, no parties to disturb us." He often apeals to us, from those who wish to slander him; saying, "Brethren, you know me, for I live among you; I visit you in your families; I speak to you from the pulpit; I repair to you in your sorrows; and I sit too at the table of your festivity." And we all agree that we have no fault to find with him, for he is exactly one of us in all respects.

Feel-w. I did not, indeed, like all his conversation, when we saw him; but I think I should like his preaching, if it answers your description. I feel inclined to stop and hear him.

Love-s. And so do I. But your church, I see, is some distance out of our way. I should like to hear him for once, extremely. But, the day is far spent, and I should like to reach the house Beautiful to-night; for I hear that there is good entertainment for pilgrims there. And I am afraid we shall not get there, if we stop. I do not like to go so far out of our way.

Puff. That need be no objection. You will find good entertainment in our village, at the house of Mr. *Easy*, or at the house of Mr. *Indifference.* They are the deacons of our church, and entertain pilgrims at free cost.

No-l. I shall certainly stop. I do not mind going a little out of the way, or staying all night. I would not miss the opportunity of hearing such a popular preacher, if I had to stay even longer.

Th. I cannot consent to stop, nor to turn aside out of our way. And besides, I have no desire to hear such preaching as has been described. And from the conversation we had with Mr. Self-conceit at the cross, it is plain, that he is an advocate of error, whom we are forbidden to hear.

Feel-w. You are too uncharitable, brother. I did not like all he said to us; but I will not condemn any man, because he differs from me in some things. We cannot all think alike any more than we can all look alike.

No-l. Brother Feel-well has spoken my mind exactly. For though I differ from him in many things, yet we have come all the way together without any unpleasant feelings between us.

Feel-w. Yes; though I differ from you all, in some things of minor importance, yet I have perfect charity for you all. And I can bear testimony, that brother Love-self, and brother No-law, and I, have come all the way from home, with the greatest harmony of feeling. Pilgrims may feel alike, if they cannot think alike; and there ought to be union among them all.

Love-s. Yes; that is right. I am for union too. And though I do not enjoy myself quite so well as brother Feel-well, and have more trouble than brother No-law; yet I believe we feel very much alike in the main, and agree in the essentials of our experience.

Puff. I am sure, then, you will be pleased to hear our minister. He preaches universal charity, and teaches us unbounded liberality towards all denominations.

Th. I beg leave to read a sentence or two from my book, which appear to me to decide the question of duty. It is written, "Take heed what ye hear.—Cease, my son, to hear the instruction which causeth to err from the words of knowledge.—I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.—If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." From what this man said to us, at the cross, it is plain, that he does not bring the doctrine of Christ, but preaches another gospel than that which is contained in the King's statute book.

Ard. I am satisfied that we ought not to hear this man. And I have no inclination, for he would rob me of my Saviour, and destroy the foundation of my hope.

F-w. You must do as you think best. I do not understand those passages of your book as you do. I depend more upon my own feelings, than upon the interpretation of such dark and difficult passages. My feelings are in favour of hearing him this time; and I know by them that it is right for me to do so.

So Feel-well, Love-self, and No-law, turned aside with Mr. Puff; and Thoughtful, and Ardent went on their way. Then said Ardent to his companion,

Ard. I thought it evidently wrong to hear this man, because he denied the divinity of our Lord, and rejected the authority of the King's statute book. But I had not thought of its being wrong to hear others whose errors are less flagrant. The passages you read, however, seem to go further than I had supposed, and prohibit hearing those who propagate any error.

Th. Every error must be hurtful in a degree; and one error naturally leads to another. It is no doubt wrong to hear those who propagate any error, which is subversive of the gospel; any fundamental error. And there must be some danger in hearing any error whatever.

Ard. How shall we know where to draw the line? For I suppose that many preach error mixed with truth, some more and some less.

Th. I am not prepared to answer that question. I should like to be better informed on that point. But so much I think is plain, that any error, which represents the gospel system to be essentially different from what it is, in doctrines, experience, or duties, must be a radical and fundamental error: And that those who propagate any such error ought not to receive any countenance or encouragement. And I think it plain, from the passages I read, that if we do give countenance and encouragement to such, we become partakers of their evil deeds.

Ard. I think I can see a reason why those who are not established in the faith would be likely to receive injury from hearing error, but I do not see why those who are well established, might not hear it sometimes with advantage to themselves. It is well to know what can be said on both sides of a controverted point.

Th. There are other ways for us to promote our own improvement, without taking any methods which the king has forbidden. But if it were not dangerous listening to deceivers, the King's book would not have given so many cautions on that point. We may have too high an opinion of our own knowledge and stability, and be led out of the way, before we are aware of the danger. But if you and I were in no danger ourselves, we might, by our example do great injury to others. If the young, the weak, and the ignorant, were to see those whom they esteem wiser and better than themselves, going to hear an advocate of error, they would be likely to think they might do so too. And thus, if we should receive no injury to ourselves, we might be the occasion of ruining others. I think it safest, therefore, to obey the precepts given, and shun every appearance of evil, and every occasion of evil to ourselves or others. And I think it a good rule that

And it can be owing to nothing but criminal stupidity, or infidelity, that any overlook the hand of God, in what they suffer or enjoy. The prophet reproves Belshazzar for disregarding the care, protection and goodness of his Creator. "The God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified." Whether men are rich or poor, whether they are prosperous, or unprosperous; whether they are in health or sickness; whether their friends, relatives and connexions are spared or taken away, they ought to acknowledge the hand of God in all his dispensations towards them. And this acknowledgment implies something more than a mere speculative belief, that all the good and evil that falls to their lot, comes through the overruling hand of God. Multitudes are willing to say in words, and they believe what they say, that God governs the world and directs all events, prosperous and adverse; and yet neither realize nor love this most interesting truth. They feel and act, rejoice or mourn, hope or fear, as though God were not in all their thoughts. But Job realized and approved of the divine agency under his afflictions. He felt and enjoyed this consoling and humiliating truth. He said, "Shall we receive *good* at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive *evil?* And again he said, "Though he slay me yet will I trust in him." He felt himself to be in the hands of God, as clay is in the hands of the potter. And thus it becomes all men to acknowledge, with deep sensibility, that it is God who gives or takes away their comforts and enjoyments, and who raises them up, or casts them down by his holy and sovereign hand. Nor is this all. For,

II. They ought to *bless*, as well as acknowledge God, under both the smiles and frowns of his providence. Job acknowledged, that God had given and taken away, and then adds what is still more important, "Blessed be the name of the Lord." He blessed God in taking away, as well as in granting his favours, though the taking away was extremely distressing and painful. And in this it is said "he sinned not," but felt and conducted right. He ought to have blessed God under both the smiles and frowns of his providence. And what was his duty in his situation, is the duty of the bereaved and afflicted, in all other similar cases. For,

1. God never takes away any favours from mankind, but what he meant to take away when he gave them. It is true, he does not inform the subjects of his mercies, how *long* he intends to continue, or how *soon* he intends to take away his favours; but he always determines in his own mind, before he bestows any blessing, how long that blessing shall continue, and whether it shall or shall not be removed during life. As he always has some purpose to answer by every good gift, so when that good gift has answered the purpose for which it was given, he takes it away, and not before. So that he acts from the same benevolent motive in taking away, as in bestowing his favours. Could we see his motives in giving, we could see his motives in taking away; and of course, could see the same goodness in taking away as in giving. He never bestows the least favour upon any individual of the human race, without weighing

the consequences of giving; nor, if he means to take it away, without weighing the consequences of taking it away. He always gives and takes away after the counsel of his own will, or his original designs, which, like himself, are perfectly holy, just, and good. If mankind have reason to bless God for giving, in any instance, they have the same reason to bless him for taking away what he has given. This is always true in respect to God, though not always true in respect to men. They may have better motives in giving than in taking away. They may give in kindness, but take away in unkindness. But the kind parent of the universe never treats his creatures so. He gives and takes away from precisely the same benevolent motives. And this is a good reason why mankind should bless him under both the smiles and frowns of his providence.

2. The favours which God continues, are generally more numerous and more important than those he removes. Life itself is paramount to all other earthly favours; for were they all taken away but that, *that* alone would overbalance all the losses and bereavements which could be sustained. Hence the prophet demands, "Wherefore should a *living* man complain?" But God generally spares far more than he takes away, and mingles innumerable mercies with his judgments. The mercies he bestows and continues are clear manifestations of his kindness to the afflicted, and demonstrate that he "does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." If he meant to treat them unkindly, he would strip them of all their comforts and enjoyments. But his mercy always rejoices against judgment, which ought to convince them that he is more ready to give than to take away. This ought to fill their hearts with gratitude, and cause them to bless the Lord at all times. For they always have reason to feel and say, "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, and because his compassions fail not."

3. The afflicted know that whatever personal evils God brings upon *them*, he constantly seeks the general good of the universe, and that all the sufferings they endure, are calculated and designed to answer that wise and benevolent purpose. All personal evils and calamities are intended and suited to promote the general good, whether they do, or do not promote the private, personal good of the sufferers. Job's calamities, which were designed for his good, were no less designed for the benefit of thousands, in all future ages. They have been, are now, and will be, instructive and consoling to multitudes, who have heard, and will hear of his sufferings and patience. Abraham's trial was designed not only for his good, but for the good of the children of Abraham from generation to generation to the end of time. The series of calamities, inflicted on the murmuring Israelites, have answered, and will answer important purposes to the world in general from age to age. God makes use of individuals to teach and to warn the world, by their conduct under his chastising hand. And the afflicted may always consider, that whether they do, or shall receive benefit from their own afflictions, the world certainly will. God is aiming at a good end in afflicting them, and this end he will certainly accomplish, whatever becomes of them. And ought they

burk, *Assistant Missionary;* and three females.

INDIANS IN OHIO.

Maumee.—On a river of that name. This mission was established by the Synod of Pittsburgh and since has been transferred to the U. F. M. S. The names of the Missionaries are not known.

HAYTI.

Commenced in 1824, among the coloured people who have lately removed from the United States, estimated at more than 5000. Rev. Benjamin F. Hughes, *Superintendent*, and Rev. William G. Pennington, *Assistant Missionary.*

III. AMERICAN BAPTIST BOARD OF MISSIONS.

Missions in Burmah—Western Africa—among the Cherokees—the Creeks—and the Indians in Michigan and Indiana.

BURMAH.

An empire of Southern Asia. It is about 1200 miles in length but varies much in breadth. Population estimated at 17,000,000. Commenced in 1814. Stations at Rangoon and Ava.

Rangoon is the principal seaport of the empire. Population 30,000.—Ava is the seat of government, 350 miles above Rangoon. Rev. Adoniram Judson, D. D., Rev. Jonathan D. Price, M. D., Rev. George H. Hough, Rev. Jonathan Wade, and Rev. George D. Boardman, *Missionaries;* Mr. Hough is also a *Printer.*

The war in Burmah has interrupted this mission for two years past, and great fears were entertained with respect to the safety of Dr. Judson and his wife, and Dr. Price. But, as before stated, these fears are now happily removed. Dr. Judson and his wife, with others, having been sent to the English army, by the government of Burmah, to obtain a peace. The late interruptions, disturbances, and perils, will probably be overruled for the furtherance of the mission.

WESTERN AFRICA.

Monrovia.—In Liberia, the residence of a colony of free coloured people, planted by the American Colonization Society. Commenced in 1821. Rev. Lot Carey, coloured man, *Missionary.* Rev. Calvin Holton, lately ordained, contemplates labouring as a Missionary among the natives near the colony.

THE CHEROKEES.

Valley Towns.—In the S. W. corner of North Carolina. Rev. Evan Jones, *Missionary;* Thomas Dawson, *Steward and Superintendent of Schools;* Isaac Cleaver, *Farmer and Mechanic;* James Wafford, *Interpreter;* Elizabeth Jones, Mary Lewis, and Ann Cleaver, *Teachers.*

Nottle.—16 miles from the Valley towns and the site of a school.

THE CREEKS.

A tribe of Indians in the western part of Georgia, and the eastern part of Alabama. Population about 16,000. Commenced in 1823.

Withington.—Within the chartered limits of Georgia. Commenced in 1823. Rev. Lee Compere, *Missionary*, Mr. Simons, and Miss Compere, *Teachers.*

INDIANS IN MICHIGAN.

These Indians are the Putawatomies and Ottawas.

Carey.—25 miles from Lake Michigan. Commenced in 1822. Rev. Isaac M'Coy, *Missionary*, Johnston Lykins, and William Polke, *Teachers;* Fanny Goodridge, *Teacher.*

Thomas.—A station among the Ottawas, about 120 miles N. E. of Carey; and the site of a school.

INDIANS OF INDIANA.

These Indians are the Miamies and Shawnees. *Fort Wayne.*—At the junction of St. Mary's river with the Maumee. A mission was commenced here, by the Rev. Mr. M'Coy, in 1820; but he removing to Carey, the station is now vacant.

IV. AMERICAN METHODIST MISSION.

The American Methodists have Missionaries among the CREEKS, CHEROKEES, WYANDOTS, and MOHAWKS.

THE CREEKS.

Coweta.—In Georgia. Commenced under the direction of the South Carolina Conference, in 1821. Rev. Isaac Smith, *Missionary;* Andrew Hamtnil, *Teacher.*

THE CHEROKEES.

There are three stations among the Cherokees, called the Upper, Lower, and Middle missions.

THE CHOCTAWS.

A mission has been established by the Mississippi Conference among the Choctaws. Rev. William Winans, *Superintendent.*

THE WYANDOTS.

Indians in the northern parts of the State of Ohio. *Upper Sandusky.*—On the Sandusky river. Commenced in 1821. Rev. James B. Finley, *Missionary.*

THE MOHAWKS.

Grand River.—In Upper Canada. Rev. Alvin Torry and Rev. William Case, *Missionaries.*

V. PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Green Bay.—In Michigan Territory. Commenced in 1824. Rev. Mr. Nash, *Missionary,* Rev. Eleazer Williams, *Agent,* Albert G. Ellis, *Catechist and Schoolmaster.*

VI. UNITED BRETHREN.

Spring-Place.—Among the Cherokee Indians, within the chartered limits of Georgia, and about 35 miles S. E. of Brainerd. Commenced in 1801. Rev. John Renatus Schmidt, *Missionary.*

Oochelogy.—About 30 miles from Spring-place, in a southern direction. Commenced in 1821. Rev. John Gambold, *Missionary,* John G. Proske, *Teacher.*

New Fairfield.—A settlement in Upper Canada.

The United Brethren's Society exists chiefly in Europe. It commenced its foreign operations nearly a century ago, and has now about 30 settlements, 170 missionaries, and 30,000 converts.

VII. SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA.

Monroe.—Among the Chickasaws; a tribe of Indians, whose country is included within the chartered limits of the States of Mississippi and Alabama: population about 6,500. Rev. T. C. Stewart, *Missionary.*

GENERAL SUMMARY.

From the preceding Survey, it appears, that the number of stations, Missionaries, &c. under the patronage of Societies in the United

States, (at least so far as we have the means of knowing,) is as follows:

Number of Stations,	64
Number of male Missionaries (of all classes,)	127
Number of Pupils in the Mission Schools, about	8,000

The number of converts from heathenism, who have been admitted to the fellowship of the several Mission churches, and who adorn their profession, we have reason to believe is very considerable; but on that, as on many other points, the statistical reports of the Missionaries are very deficient. It should be stated, however, to the glory of divine grace, that, within the two years past, several of the Missions comprehended in this Survey, have enjoyed the special visitations of the Spirit of God, and many of the heathen have been hopefully converted. No former period in the history of American Missions has been so fraught with success, as the past two years; and at no period were the prospects of future success on the whole so flattering, as they are at the present time. It should be added, moreover, that never would a diminution of liberality and effort, in the American churches, be attended with such disastrous consequences to the spiritual, everlasting interests of the heathen world. Never would the shock have been so great; never would it have been felt in so many places.

Let Individuals, let Churches, let the whole Community, then, not relax, but increase, their efforts—not diminish, but augment, their contributions. And let prayers be offered without ceasing to the Author of Redemption, that the tidings of His love may soon be sent to every nation, and the efficacy of his atonement be soon known and experienced by all the inhabitants of the earth.

Religious Intelligence.

REVIVALS.

An interesting narrative of a revival of religion in Salem has recently appeared in the Recorder and Telegraph. "This ancient town has been favoured with many seasons of refreshing from the Lord. Ever since its first settlement, in the year 1628, it has been blessed with pious and faithful ministers of the gospel. It shared, in common with the capital of New England and many other parts of the country, in that glorious revival which marks the age of Edwards, Whitefield, and the Tennants, and other luminaries of the American church, whose names will be had in everlasting remembrance.

There was an extensive work of grace about the year 1786, and another of considerable extent in the year 1804.—In the early part of 1810 a precious shower of Divine influence was shed down, almost simultaneously, upon this place and several of the towns in the vicinity. In Salem, and in the five contiguous towns of Marblehead, Danvers, Beverly, Manchester, and Wenham, the whole number of hopeful converts, the fruit of that

memorable work, was about 600. In the latter part of April 1824, a young man of the Rev. Mr. Emerson's congregation, who moved in the higher walks of society, had a numerous circle of acquaintance, and was held by them in high estimation for his amiable disposition and social virtues, was suddenly arrested in the midst of youthful bloom, and the gaieties of fashionable life, and hurried into eternity, in a manner peculiarly solemn and affecting. That young man seems to have been made an example for the warning and salvation of others. Several of his gay companions were immediately aroused from the slumbers of impenitence, and found no peace until they submitted to the terms of peace proposed in the gospel. That alarming providence produced a general solemnity among the young, and was the cause, as numbers afterwards stated, of impressing their minds with the necessity of that religion, of which they found themselves destitute. During the month of May, things remained in awful silence and suspense. The cloud seemed to be standing over us, emitting here and there a drop upon the parched fields, and exciting in those who watched at the alternate emotions of hope and fear, as they observed the changes in its aspect. In the beginning of June the rain descended. The influence spread from heart to heart, from house to house, from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, increasing as it went, until the excitement became general and strong. It was not indeed, like a rushing mighty wind, or the pouring of a torrent, but like the distilling of the gentle dew, silent, yet effectual. Religious meetings, which were well attended before, were now full to overflowing, and solemn as the house of death.

But few of the recent subjects of grace made a public profession of religion until the first Sabbath in November. On that day, which is memorable to many, 55 were admitted into Mr. Emerson's church, 33 into the Tabernacle church, under the care of Rev. Mr. Cornelius; and on the following month, 32 were admitted into the Presbyterian church, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Williams. In the two churches first named, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is celebrated every month; and from that day to the present, some have been admitmitted into these churches at almost every celebration.

The following schedule will show the numbers which have been admitted into the several churches therein named since the commencement of the revival.

To the Rev. Mr. Emerson's church,	Whole number	118
	By profession	92
To Rev. Mr. Cornelius' church,	Whole number	100
	By profession	98
To Rev. Mr. Williams' church,	Whole number	39
	By profession	38
To Dr. Bolles' (Baptist) church,	Whole number	39
	By profession	35
To the Episcopal church,	Whole number	16
	All by profession.	
	Total—	307

Of these, 95 were males, and 212 females; 117 were heads of families. The number of those who have, in a judgment of charity, experienced a renewal of heart, but have not made a profession, may be estimated at 60 or 70."

The writer of the above account adds, "that in the four Paedobaptist societies above mentioned, about two thirds of those who have experienced "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," were children of the church, having been consecrated to God in their infancy." Another fact not less

interesting is, that 111 of those who have made a profession of religion within the last 20 months, were members of Bible classes.

Whately and vicinity.—An interesting work of divine grace is said to be going forward in Whately and vicinity. More than one hundred cherish a hope of having passed from death unto life in Whately.—*Rec. and Tel.*

In Monson, Mass.—"In August ten were added to the church in Monson; in October fifty; in December eighteen, and ten stand propounded for admission in February."—*Rel. Int.*

Maine.—For two or three months past, the town of New-Gloucester, in the county of Cumberland, has been blessed with a revival of religion, the influence of which is likely to be extensive and salutary. Some of the neighbouring towns are likewise favoured in a similar manner.

Vermont.—Hopes are entertained that about 20 students of the college in Middlebury became truly pious during the term ending in December. Others were, at the close of the term, anxious with respect to their spiritual well being. Nor has the revival been confined to the college. The town has shared largely in the blessing. About 100 are thought to be the fruits of the revival there. Nor indeed has it been restricted to the town. The whole region for thirty or forty miles, seems to be more or less moved. In several towns, we may say with confidence, that revivals have commenced; and in some, with great power.—*Rec. & Tel.*

In Cabot, Vt.—"By a private letter addressed to a friend in this town, it appears that a powerful revival has recently commenced in Cabot, Caladonia county, Vt. Nearly one hundred it is said are already rejoicing in hope, and many others are under deep and pungent conviction."—*N. E. Obs.*

In New-York State.—At Amber, a small village near Auburn, there was a very interesting work of grace in December; besides encouraging appearances in Westmoreland and in several other towns in that region. There are said to be revivals, also, in Fabius, Truxton, Hamilton, Western, and Vernon Centre.

In De Kalb, N. Y.—A revival of religion commenced in this place in August last, and is still progressing. About 70 have in the judgment of charity become the children of God.—*N. Y. Obs.*

In Elizabethtown, N. J.—Friday of December last was observed in this place as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, by appointment of the Synod of New-Jersey. The first decided symptoms of a revival appeared on this day. Ever since, the seriousnesness has been increasing, and for the last two weeks, with great rapidity and power. More than *one hundred* are known to be awakened.

In Kingston, U. C.—For fifteen months past, the Spirit has been poured out upon Kingston in Upper Canada. The work is said to be still on the increase. "About forty have become hopefully pious in this place, and a few in neighbouring townships."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

An answer to a Question proposed by Discipulus, will be inserted in our next number.——Fidelis is received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. APRIL, 1826. No. 4.

SERMON.

ECCL. v. 15. *As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as he came, and shall take nothing of his labour, which he may carry away in his hand.*

SOLOMON was extensively acquainted with the world, and capable of making wise and just observations upon the characters, stations and employments of mankind. His observations God has been pleased to transmit to all future generations for their instruction and benefit. In the preceding verses, he makes particular remarks upon men of power, upon men of property, and upon men of industry; and then takes notice of one error or sore evil, to which they are all exposed, which is an undue attachment to worldly objects. "There is," says he, "a sore evil which I have seen under the sun, namely, riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt. But those riches perish by evil travel; and he begetteth a son, and there is nothing in his hand. As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as he came, and shall take nothing of his labour, which he may carry away in his hand." From these plain, simple truths, he justly concludes, that it is a great and dangerous error for any of mankind to place their supreme affections and hopes upon any exterior worldly objects, which are no part of their existence, but may be taken away from them, while they remain what they were before, rational and accountable creatures. Tho' after they come into the world, they may attain a great many things in it, yet they must go out of it into another state, whither they can carry nothing but themselves. This then appears to be the plain meaning of the text:

AS MANKIND BRING NOTHING INTO THE WORLD BUT THEMSELVES, SO THEY CAN CARRY NOTHING OUT OF IT BUT THEMSELVES.

I shall

I. Consider in what respects, they bring nothing into the world but themselves.

II. Consider in what respects, they can carry nothing out of the world but themselves. And,

III. Consider in what respects, they do carry themselves out of the world.

I. Let us consider in what respects, mankind bring nothing into the world but themselves. When they come into the world, every thing in it is exterior to and dis-

tinct from their existence, and constitutes no property of it. Their spirit, which is immaterial, and which constitutes the essence of their existence, is distinct from all material objects, which form no part or property of it. The air they breathe, the light they see, the covering that warms them, and the food they take, is no essential part of themselves, which they bring into the world. But if God preserves their lives from infancy to childhood, or from childhood to manhood, or from manhood to old age, they employ their time, their talents, and exertions, in acquiring a great many necessary and desirable objects, of which they were totally destitute when they came into the world. In particular,

1. They generally acquire larger, or smaller portions of worldly property. Some become very rich in silver and gold, houses and lands, flocks and herds, and in every thing that nature and art can furnish, to please the eye, the ear, the palate, the fancy, and every selfish propensity of the heart. There are, however, but a few comparatively, who abound in so much wealth and affluence, and obtain so many of this world's goods. There are many more, who obtain nothing more than the necessaries and conveniences of life, by all their labours and exertions. And there is a very large number, who for some reason or another, never possess any property, but are from the beginning to the end of life assisted and supported by others. But all men, whether rich or poor, have some share of the wealth and affluence, which abounds in the world, which is something distinct from themselves, and what they did not bring into the world with them.

2. Some men arrive at great worldly honor, power, and influence. They become kings, princes, nobles, governors, subordinate rulers and magistrates from the highest to the lowest degrees of office. These are worldly objects, which are generally highly esteemed and greatly sought after. But no human creature ever brought any of these things into the world with him. No man was ever born a king, or prince, or ruler of the lowest grade. The infant of a king, or of a nobleman, is as destitute of honor, power, or influence, as the infant of a beggar. These are mere appendages of a man, which he never brought into the world, and which are no part or property of his existence, but are all exterior to and distinct from it; for they may all be taken from him, and he still remain precisely the same man. Worldly honors and distinctions no more belong to his existence, than the clothes that he wears. I may further observe,

3. There is a certain kind of happiness, which mankind never bring into the world with them. But after they have come into the world, they derive a great portion of happiness from it. The world abounds in objects, which are suited to promote human happiness. But this worldly happiness is not essential to mankind; for they can neither possess, nor enjoy it any longer than they live upon earth. All worldly happiness is limited by life, and as soon as that ceases, all the happiness to be derived from the world ceases. As soon as Dives exchanged this for another world, he lost all the happiness which he enjoyed on earth. Thus it appears, that mankind bring nothing into the world but them-

selves. They come into the world as poor as creatures can be. They come into the world, as Job and Solomon emphatically say, naked, destitute, and helpless. They possess neither wealth, nor power, nor happiness. And tho' after they come into the world, they may acquire all these things, yet they are mere appendages, which are totally distinct from themselves, and make not the least addition to their real existence. They never become personal properties, for they continue the same persons, whether they do, or do not possess and enjoy them.

II. Let us now consider in what respects, they can carry nothing out of the world but themselves. And here it is easy to see, that as they brought nothing into the world, which was exterior to and distinct from themselves, so they can carry nothing out, which is exterior to and distinct from themselves. They will go out of the world as naked and destitute of all things which are exterior to and distinct from themselves as they came into it. This Solomon asserts in the text and the words immediately following it. "As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go *as he came*, and shall take nothing of *his labour*, which he may carry away in his hand. And this also is a sore evil, that *in all points* as he came so shall he go." We have seen that man comes into the world entirely destitute of worldly wealth, worldly honor, and worldly happiness. These Solomon calls the fruits of *his* labour; or of the labours of others; and in *all these points*, as he *came so shall he go*, and carry nothing away in his hands. All these things may be taken out of his hands while he *lives*, and certainly, at his death, when he leaves the world. For, as Solomon says in another place, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Here *spirit* is represented as the *essence* of the man, and his body and every thing else connected with the body, as exterior to, and totally distinct from his spirit, or proper existence. The world, and all its inhabitants, and all its scenes and objects, are exterior to and distinct from every man, while he remains on earth. And none of these shall he carry away with him, when he goes out of time into eternity. It now remains to consider,

III. In what respects, mankind at death, carry themselves out of this into another world. Though they carry nothing else, yet it is plainly supposed in the text, and every where in scripture, that they carry themselves out of time into eternity, when they die. It is proper therefore, to consider in what respects, they carry themselves out of this into another world. Here it may be observed,

1. That when they carry themselves out of the world, they will carry with them all their intellectual powers and faculties. Their perception, reason, conscience, and memory, are intellectual powers and faculties, are essential parts or properties of their rational nature, and cannot be separated from it, without destroying their rational existence. Take away perception, reason, conscience and memory, from any man, and he no longer remains a rational creature, or a moral and accountable agent. The intellectual powers and faculties of a man, are not mere appendages, like the clothes he

36234

wears, or the objects with which he is surrounded, that may be taken away, and he still remain the same rational and accountable creature. Though when Moses died he did not carry away his body, nor any material object; yet he carried himself away, with all his rational powers and faculties, which were properly himself; for we know that he afterwards appeared as the same man on the mount of transfiguration. Though when Dives died, he did not carry away his body, nor any of the good things he had possessed; yet he carried away his perception, reason, conscience and memory, all which he discovered in seeing and conversing with Abraham. It is impossible, that men should, at death, carry themselves out of this into another world, without carrying all their rational powers and faculties with them.

2. When men leave this world, and go into another, they carry with them every thing, which is inseparably connected with their rational powers and faculties, and which is an essential part of their *moral* existence. In particular,

1. All their knowledge, which they acquired while they lived in the world, by education, instruction, and observation, through every period of their age, whether in childhood, youth, or riper years. As soon as they begin to exercise their rational powers after they come into the world, they begin to acquire knowledge, and they continue to increase their knowledge, by all they read, or hear, or see, every day, until they either lose their senses, or leave the world. This is true of all persons, whether young or old, learned or unlearned, and whether possessed of superior or inferior natural talents. Now, all this stock of knowledge, be it larger or smaller, belongs to him that possesses it, and is as much a part of himself, as his natural powers and faculties. It is all lodged in his memory, and he can no more divest himself of it, than he can divest himself of his memory, or any other rational power and faculty. His knowledge is a part of *himself*, which he cannot annihilate or destroy. Paul will forever remember what he saw and heard when he was exalted to the third heaven; and so every man will always remember all that he ever saw or knew in this world, when he goes into another; for when he goes into another, he must carry himself, and all that essentially belongs to himself, and all his knowledge is a constituent part of himself, and not a mere appendage, which he may lose or throw away, and still remain the same person.

2. When men leave this world and go into another, they carry with them all their *moral exercises*, whether right or wrong. Every thing that they may be said to know in this world, is an object in the view of which they have some right or wrong moral exercise. I will mention only a few particulars.

All men will carry out of this into another world, all the moral exercises, which they ever had towards the being they called God. The belief of some supreme being, generally prevails among all nations; and this belief never fails to excite in their minds the moral affections of love or hatred, hope or fear, joy or sorrow. And these moral exercises towards their supposed deity, all the heathen world will carry with them into eternity. In the christian world there are but few who do

ometime in life think of the living and true God, and exe some moral affections to- his existence, his perfec-, his laws, and government. ie in the state of nature, al- exercise wrong affections rds him, whether they love for his favours, or hate him is holiness and sovereignty. all good men think much about God, and sometimes cise right, and sometimes g affections towards his cha-r, his conduct, and designs. y never feel indifferent to- ls him, and therefore all their s, and moral exercises re- ting him, are sinful or holy. the moral exercises of all towards God, are a part, and nost important part, of their ence, which they must ne- rily carry away with them, never they shall leave this d.

nose who read, or hear the el, think about Christ, their e and gracious Redeemer, came from heaven, and took him our nature, and suffer- ad died for our salvation, and holds the reins of universal rnment, and is preparing all gs for the day of judgment, n he will dispense eternal re- ls and punishments to all the an race. He once put the us question himself, "What e ye of Christ?" It becomes y one to put this question to elf; for every one does think t him, and when he thinks t him, he always exercises t or wrong affections towards

Sinners always exercise ng affections; and saints al- s holy, or unholy affections rds him. Christ as God and is the most interesting cha- er that ever was exhibited re the eyes of this sinful and perishing world, and of course, mankind have had the most lively and sensible exercises towards him. Some have had most lively and transporting exercises of love towards him, and others the most painful exercises of hatred. And all these exercises are a part of themselves, which they cannot help carrying away with them, when they exchange this, for another world.

Those who read, or hear the gospel, never fail to exercise right, or wrong affections towards the great, glorious, and interesting truths and objects, which it unfolds and exhibits to their view. They scarcely ever have more holy, or more sinful exercises of heart, than while they read or hear the gospel. And some read and hear it from childhood to old age. What numerous and important exercises must such persons have during a long life? And all these are parts of themselves, which they must carry away with them, when they leave this, and enter into another and eternal state.

This world abounds with objects which attract the attention and excite the affections of mankind towards them. All the objects by which they are surrounded, all the persons with whom they converse and act, and all the employments in which they are engaged, tend to occupy their attention, and draw forth right, or wrong affections, every day, every hour, and almost every moment. It is next to impossible to avoid seeing and attending to these worldly objects more or less, and when they do see and attend to them, it is absolutely impossible to avoid exercising right, or wrong affections towards them. What an immense number of moral exerci-

ses must a person have in a day, in a week, in a month, in a year, and in sixty or seventy years! All these holy, or unholy exercises belong to the very existence of the persons, who are the subjects of them, and who must carry them into another world, whenever they leave this.

There is another class of moral exercises, which ought to be mentioned in this connexion. I mean the exercises which every person exercises towards himself. Mankind may exercise right or wrong feeling towards themselves, as well as towards others. Probably every individual much oftener thinks of himself, than of any other person, and of course, much oftener has right, or wrong views and moral exercises towards himself than towards any other person. Those who may be the most thoughtless, stupid, and inattentive to every thing else, may be the most attentive to themselves, and have the most wrong exercises towards their own persons and own interests. Every one can easily see and believe, that his own moral exercises in regard to himself, properly belong to his moral existence, which he must carry with him wherever he goes in life, and wherever he goes at death. Such an immense stock of moral exercises mankind must carry with them when they go out of time into eternity. It is a great and dangerous error to imagine that our rational faculties, our acquired knowledge, and our moral exercises, are things distinct and separable from ourselves; for these are the very things which constitute our natural and moral existence. If these were taken from us, as every thing in the world may be taken from us, we should no longer exist rational, moral, accountable beings. But these never will be taken from us, while we live, nor when we die. These are *ourselves*, and wherever we go, they must go with us, and continue with us, as long as we exist. Every man has abundant reason to reverence himself; for taking himself all in all, he is to himself an immensely important being!

IMPROVEMENT.

1. This subject shows the folly and guilt of those, who seek after great things in this world, and place their supreme hopes and happiness in the enjoyment of them. The largest possessions and highest enjoyments of this world, cannot be of much importance to those, who must very soon leave it. The high as well as the low, the rich as well as the poor, must meet together in the grave, stripped of all their power and wealth, and worldly distinctions, and enjoyments. The man of power, the man of wealth, and the man of affluence, will be but a mere man, as soon as his head is laid in the dust. None of the great things of this world belong to the nature and essence of men, and therefore they may be, and certainly will be entirely stripped of them, when they are called to go, as naked as they were born, into eternity. In this view, the world and the things of the world, must appear as vain and empty, as the sacred writers represent them. Death stamps a vanity on all earthly objects, and a folly on all who place their supreme hopes and happiness in the enjoyment of them. It is the nature of all worldly objects to obstruct rather than to promote contentment, in which true and lasting happiness consists. So the apostle ex-

pressly declares. "For, says he, we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content." Christ represents that man as a fool, who laid up goods for many years, that did not afford him contentment, but suddenly disappointed all his hopes and happiness for ever. The wealth and happiness of Dives, only prepared him for greater torments in the world of wo. All, who place their supreme hopes and happiness in any of the possessions or enjoyments of this world, must certainly, and soon be completely disappointed; and complete disappointment terminates in complete despair. How many of the men of the world, who had gained and enjoyed the most of it, have found this to be true, by bitter experience, when they were constrained to go out of the world as they came into it, poor, and wretched and miserable!

2. If men, when they leave this world, cannot carry away any thing with them, but their rational powers, their intellectual knowledge, and their moral exercises; then they will appear very different to themselves in eternity, from what they did before they entered into the world of spirits. They will find themselves stripped of every thing exterior to their natural and moral existence, and totally destitute of all those external marks of distinction, which they had once enjoyed in their probationary state. How differently will a king appear to himself without his crown? The nobleman, without the badges of his nobility? The rich man without his wealth? The ruler without his subjects? The master without his servants? And every man, without any worldly distinction? Here, mankind are extremely apt to form a false estimate of themselves. They are very ready to imagine, that they are what their external appendages denote them to be. But in eternity, all their false opinions of themselves will be rectified. They will not measure themselves, by their former stations, their former possessions, their former employments, nor by any of their former circumstances of life. How differently did Solomon appear to himself, after death had stripped him of all his exterior glory? How differently did Herod appear to himself, after death had robbed him of his supposed divinity? He found himself to be a mere worthless man, instead of a god. Though it be difficult for any man to conceive how differently he will appear to himself, after he goes out of time into eternity; yet every one ought to anticipate the amazing change which awaits him.

3. If mankind will carry with them all their intellectual powers, all their acquired knowledge, and all their moral exercises out of this, into the eternal world; then they will appear to themselves greater and vastly more important creatures, than they had viewed themselves to be in this world. Here they are continually forgetting the greatest part of the knowledge they have acquired. The objects they have seen, the scenes through which they have passed, the transactions in which they have been engaged, and the moral exercises they have had. Who remembers all that he has seen, and heard, and known, and done, and thought, through a day, a week, a month, a year, or all the days he has liv-

ed? But if men carry themselves into eternity with all their powers and faculties and every thing that belongs to their rational and moral existence, they will be able to recollect all the knowledge they ever acquired, all the persons and objects they had ever known, and all the moral exercises they ever had towards God, and Christ, and the gospel, and the world, and themselves. As all these things are lodged in their memories, they may recollect them, and in order to their being properly rewarded and punished, they must be recollected. The objects which once diverted their attention from themselves, and made them forget, will be removed, and it will be only for God to strengthen and invigorate their memories, and then they may recollect and retain all that they had ever learned, or known, and all the moral exercises they had ever had towards all the objects of their recollection. When they recollect all these things, and realize that they all belong to themselves, they will be astonished at their own existence, and their vast capacity to make constant and perpetual advances in knowledge, whether it will increase their holiness and happiness, or their sinfulness and misery. We admire the greatness of Solomon; but we have never known a thousandth part of his greatness, and he did not know a thousandth part of it, till he recollected himself in eternity. Men are apt to think that all the knowledge they have forgotten is lost, and that all their moral exercises, which they cannot recollect are annihilated; but they are no more lost or annihilated, than any other part of their existence. When we see an old man, who has lost his sight, his hearing, his memory, and his voice, we are apt to view him as a very insignificant and unimportant creature; but we ought to view him as possessing all the rational powers, all the stock of knowledge he ever acquired, and all the moral exercises he ever had from his first, to his second childhood. These all belong to his existence, and will constitute his greatness, when he leaves this world, and goes into eternity. Though men may lose a vast many things, while they are passing from stage to stage in life; yet they never lose any part of their existence, but are constantly adding to it, as long as they live. Methuselah made continual additions to the magnitude and importance of his existence in the course of more than nine hundred years, and he has been adding to it from the day of his death to this present day. Man's constant and perpetual growth in existence, demands his most serious consideration. There will be no small saints, or small sinners, in another world. They will all grow much faster there, than they ever did here. They will never cease growing. This must be a most animating thought to saints, and most alarming thought to sinners.

4. If mankind must go out of this, into another world at death; then death is a most solemn and interesting event. It would be so, if it only called them out of this world, and deprived them of their houses and lands, their riches and power, their friends and connexions, and every thing deemed great and valuable in this life. Men are often deeply affected when they lose their worldly possessions and enjoyments, but much more, when they

are bereaved, time after time, of their nearest relatives, and dearest friends. These calamities and afflictions, however, are light in comparison of death, which, in one moment, strips them of every earthly object, possession and enjoyment. When death calls them to bid a final farewell to all these things, it must appear to every one a very serious and interesting event. But death has something far more formidable in it, than merely calling men out of this world; for, at the same moment, it calls them into eternity, from whence they shall never return. They cannot leave themselves, as they leave their appendages, behind. They must carry themselves, with all their rational and immortal powers and moral exercises, into a new, untried, and everlasting state. This must be interesting beyond all present conception. Though the antecedent and concomitants of death may be extremely painful and distressing, yet the consequences of death, are unspeakably more solemn and interesting. The living see only the outside of death; but the dead see the inside. The living see only what it is to leave this world; but the dead see what it is to be in another world. The dead probably feel the whole weight of eternity, the first moment they find themselves in it. This solemn and interesting transition out of time into eternity awaits all the living. They must die, and leave this world, and go into another, which is full of objects of infinitely more magnitude, magnificence, and importance, than any they ever saw or knew before. Though men are extremely apt to put far away the evil day of death; yet the more formidable and interesting it will be, when it comes. The longer men live in this world, the more knowledge and the more moral exercises of heart will they have to carry with them into eternity, and a more solemn account will they have to give before the supreme tribunal. Hence says Solomon: "Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun: but if a man live *many years* and rejoice in them all, yet let him remember the *days of darkness*: for they shall be *many*."

5. If men must leave this world, and go into eternity when they leave it; then this life is the only state of probation. The scenes and objects in this world, together with the means of grace and offers of salvation here enjoyed, are all suited to try the hearts of men. The world, the things of the world, and the men of the world, are all objects towards which persons of all ages, ranks, and conditions, may exercise either right or wrong, holy, or unholy affections; and they never fail to make, a good or bad impression, upon every person. All have their choice to take God or the world for their portion, to labour for the meat that perisheth, or for that which endureth to everlasting life, to walk in the straight and narrow path to heaven, or in the broad road to destruction. Good and evil, life and death, are set before them, and they possess full liberty to choose or reject the great salvation offered to them in the gospel. After men have gone through this state of trial and probation, there is no occasion for any other probationary state; and neither scripture, nor reason gives them any ground to expect another. It seems as though it must be owing to judicial blindness, if any

entertain a hope, that they may embrace the gospel and obtain salvation, after they leave this world, and carry all their impenitence, unbelief, and enmity to God into eternity. As men leave this world, so they must go into the next. If they leave this world sinners, they must go into another, sinners; and wherever they go sinners, they must go poor, blind, naked, and wretched, and meet with an awful disappointment, if they expect to be happy.

6. If men must leave this world and go into eternity at death, then there is nothing but vital piety that can prepare them for their great and last change. Neither their wealth, nor power, nor costly enjoyments can prepare them for it; for these they cannot carry away with them. But if they could carry them away with them, they would be no substitute for holiness of heart, and no qualifications for the employments and enjoyments of heaven. "For without holiness no man can see and enjoy God." Men must be holy as God is holy, and perfect as he is perfect, in order to dwell and be happy in his presence. Upon this ground only, David built his hopes of future and eternal blessedness. He says to God with confidence, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy likeness." Holiness consists in disinterested and universal benevolence, which is a free, voluntary exercise of the heart; it essentially belongs to the person who exercises it, and is a part of his moral existence, which cannot be taken from him. All vital piety consists in such pure, holy love, and is the *one thing* needful, to prepare men to leave this world, and to go into another. So Christ told Martha, when she appeared too worldly minded. "Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and troubled about many things: *but one thing is needful:* and *Mary hath chosen that good part which shall not be taken from her.*" Those who possess vital piety in this world, must necessarily carry it with them, when they go into eternity, where it will qualify them for complete and endless blessedness.

As soon as men become cordially reconciled to God, and take him for their supreme portion, and renounce the world and the things of the world, they are properly prepared to leave the world and the things of the world, and partake of a blessed immortality beyond the grave. But if they do not thus become heartily united to God, and disunited from the world, they must be for ever wretched when they die. They can carry nothing away with them to make them happy, but every thing to make them miserable. They must carry away their rational powers, their intellectual knowledge, and all the evil imaginations of their hearts which they ever had, and while these are recollected, they will prove a perpetual and eternal source of self-reproach, self-condemnation, and perfect despair. Behold, now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation: Now is the only time to prepare to leave this world and to go into another. It deeply concerns all to inquire, whether they are prepared for their great and last change. The preparation is vital piety. Have you made this preparation?

For the Christian Magazine.

ANSWER TO A QUESTION.

Messrs. Editors,—I observed in your Magazine for February, a question, which, although not difficult, demands an answer. The question, if I rightly remember—I have not the Magazine before me—is this: 'How are the words of the Apostle James, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world," consistent with the opinion so often expressed in the pulpit and the writings of theologians, that true religion consists in disinterested love to God and man?'

The opinion that true religion consists in disinterested* love to God and man, seems to be founded upon the following declaration of Christ, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commands hang all the law and the prophets." These two commands, it will be perceived, comprize all which the law or the prophets have inculcated. It will also be perceived that they are fulfilled by *love* to God and man. This love is called disinterested, to distinguish it from those selfish affections which mankind often feel towards God, and their fellow-creatures, but which are no obedience to his law, and have in them nothing of the nature of true religion. Now if disinterested love is the fulfilling of the law, it is certainly proper to say, that true religion consists in this: for every considerate person must perceive, that true religion consists in obedience to the commands of God. But how, it is asked, is this definition of religion consistent with the one which is given by the Apostle James? To this, it is replied, all seeming difference between the definition drawn from the words of Christ, and that given by the Apostle James, vanishes, the moment we consider that Christ, in the passage above quoted, speaks of religion as it exists in the heart, and the Apostle speaks of it, as it appears in the external conduct. The one names the principle in the abstract: the other the fruits which it produces. A moment's attention to what the Apostle says of religion, must be sufficient to satisfy any one, that it implies that love of which the Saviour speaks, and which is so often mentioned by the sacred writers

* By disinterested love is meant an impartial affection:—an affection which regards every object according to its value:—not an affection which totally disregards self, but which regards it only according to its apparent value in comparison with others. A man in the exercise of disinterested love to God, makes God the supreme object of his regard, because he is an object supremely excellent. In the exercise of disinterested love to his neighbour, he regards him as himself, because he is an object of equal value and importance with himself. Selfishness is the love of self, merely because it is self. In the exercise of this, a man makes himself the supreme object of his regard. He does not love God with all the heart, although he is supremely excellent, but he loves himself with all his heart, even although he may be perfectly insignificant and worthless. He does not love his neighbour as himself, but less than himself, and only as he may be supposed in some way or other to promote the happiness of himself, even although he may be a person of distinguished and acknowledged worth. Disinterested love is the opposite of selfishness.

as the essence of religion. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless, and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." No one can suppose, that merely the outward act of visiting the afflicted, is all which is meant by pure and undefiled religion. If merely this, constitutes true religion, then those are truly religious, who visit the widow and fatherless for the purpose of defrauding or oppressing them. But this is too gross an absurdity, and too palpable a falsehood, to be admitted by any man in his senses. But if merely the outward act of visiting the afflicted, be not true religion, we must look for something in the feelings of the heart, or in the motives of those who visit them, which will constitute it an act of true religion. Now with what motives, or feelings of heart, must they visit the afflicted, in order to constitute this act, an act of true religion? The answer to this inquiry is easy. If true religion is obedience to the commandments of God, they must, in order to be truly religious, visit the afflicted with the feelings which he requires them to have. But what are these feelings? Our Saviour has taught us in his words, above quoted, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This impartial, or disinterested affection to their neighbour, is something which will influence them to visit him in distress; something which will influence them to relieve his wants, so far as they are able; and something which, as it obeys the command of God, is truly acceptable in his sight. It is, then, disinterested love for the fatherless and widows, which renders visiting them in their affliction an act of true religion. The Apostle did not intend to intimate, that a visit made to them, without the feelings which accompany this affection, had any more religion in it, than any other outward act. So far, then, are the Apostle's words from being inconsistent with the opinion, that true religion consists primarily in love, that they appear thus far to confirm it.

But the other part of the Apostle's words demand our attention. It will be seen that this as plainly implies supreme love to God, as that which we have considered, does disinterested love to man. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the Fatherless and widows in their affliction, and *to keep himself unspotted from the world.*" The truly religious man then keeps himself unspotted from the world. But it is evident that no man does this, who is under the influence of the love of the world. The love of the world, is that which assimilates mankind to the world, and tarnishes their characters with all its defilements. Nor does any man keep himself unspotted from the world, who conforms to the sinful maxims of the world. A man, who, in his outward conduct, follows the course of this world, is a man of the world. He belongs to the world, in distinction from the followers of Christ, and his character is spotted with the sins of the world. Now what will keep a man unspotted from the world? As he cannot be unspotted from the world while under the influence of the love of the world, it is evident there must be something in his heart, which shall carry him above all its attractions. As he cannot be unspotted from the world, while

he makes the maxims of the world, the rule of his conduct, it is undeniable that he must feel the influence of some principle, which will lead him to conform to the precepts and example of Christ. But what is there that will wean his affections from the world, and carry him above all its attractions? What is there that will influence him to order his conduct after the example and precepts of Christ? It is "the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost." This, and this only, can destroy, or effectually counteract the strong influence of the love of the world, which is so natural to mankind, and leads them to place their affections on things above. The love of God too, that supreme love to his character, which both the law and the gospel inculcate, is the only thing which can influence fallen men, cheerfully and uniformly to adopt the example of Christ, and the self-denying precepts of his religion, instead of the maxims of the world, as the rule of their conduct. It is plain, therefore, that the definition, which the Apostle James has given of religion, implies the same supreme love to God, and disinterested love to man, which are required by the Saviour, and often inculcated by the Apostles.

It is no uncommon thing with the Apostle, to define a principle by the effects which it produces. In the following passage, the Apostle John defines the love of God, by its effects. "This is the love of God, that ye keep his commandments." Here, external obedience to the commands of God, which is really an effect of love to God, and which, in various other passages of scripture, is so represented, is spoken of as the love itself. Because the love of God is the principle, which will invariably produce obedience to God's commands. John speaks of this obedience as being the love of God. The same reason is to be assigned for the peculiarity of James' expression, respecting religion. Because visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and keeping unspotted from the world, are effects, which that love to God and man, in which true religion consists, will invariably produce; this Apostle speaks of these effects as religion itself. And in this he is justified by custom, the supreme law of language. It is a practice common both to sacred and profane writers, occasionally to describe the cause by its effects, and the effects by their cause.

A.

For the Christian Magazine.

AN EXPOSITION OF PROVERBS, XXI. 16.

"*The man that wandereth from the way of understanding, shall remain in the congregation of the dead.*"

THE meaning of the first part of this verse is very obvious. The *way of understanding* is the way of wisdom, or, of God's commands. To *wander from them*, is to disregard them as a rule of life, and to live according to another rule, that of our inclinations. Concerning those who do this, it is affirmed, that they shall remain *in the congregation of the dead.* The import is, that, without repentance, they will go to that congregation, and ever remain with them. So far all is plain. There is no difficulty. But what is the meaning of "*the congregation of the dead?*" Spiritual death cannot be here intended: for those who wander from the way of un-

derstanding are already of the congregation of such as are dead in trespasses and sins. Does the passage then declare that none who are of that number will ever be separated from it? In other words, that none of them will ever be renewed and sanctified? Certainly not: for this would be contrary to fact, and to what is elsewhere taught in the scriptures. Are we to suppose, then, that the passage was designed to teach us no more than this, that those who continue to disregard the commands of God, and do not turn from their evil ways, shall die and dwell in the dust with those who are already there? This is true in relation to all others, no less than in relation to them. It is unquestionable, that the passage declares, and was intended to declare, some evil, peculiar to those who wander from the way of understanding. But to die and to be lodged with others in the grave, is not an evil peculiar to them. "For what man is he that liveth and shall not see death?" Nor, are we to suppose that the instruction contained in the verse is this, there is no resurrection for those who wander from the way of understanding: for the scriptures declare that there will be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust. All the dead, including both the righteous and the wicked, will be raised from their graves at the last day. The question returns, what are we to understand by the *congregation of the dead?* Who compose it? The true answer is, *the place or assembly of the giants*, who are mentioned in Genesis, vi. 4. "There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men (like their fathers) which were of old, men of renown." These giants were men, who in the pride and confidence of their bodily stature, became despisers of God and holiness, and oppressors of men. They were enormous in wickedness, as well as in stature. They oppressed and corrupted the earth. God took vengeance upon them for their impiety and deeds of gross iniquity, and destroyed them with the flood. In the verse at the head of this paper, and in other places of scripture, it is implied and intimated that they are still in existence and in a state of punishment. The declaration is that those who wander from the way of understanding, and die in this way, shall go to be with those giants, and ever remain with them. The Hebrew Bible justifies the exposition given *of the congregation of the dead.* Two words are used; the one of which signifies congregation, the other, (Rephaim,) giants. The Septuagint, or the translation of the Seventy, furnishes further evidence of the correctness of the exposition which I have given. *Εν συναγωγη γιγαντων*, is the Greek which in our translation is rendered, the congregation of the dead. A learned Rabbi explains the sentence under consideration, by, *in cœtu gehennæ*, which serves to strengthen the meaning I have assigned to it.

To show further, that a right exposition has been given, I would observe, that there are other passages of scripture in which the like expression is used with that in the verse before us, Prov. ii. 18, "For her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the dead." Prov. ix. 18, "But he knoweth not that the

dead are there; and that her guests are in the depths of hell." Upon examination, the learned reader will find, in the original languages, that the word for death, in both these passages, signifies giants, and that there is an undoubted reference to those who were destroyed by the flood and are now in a state of punishment. The evil intended in these two verses, is manifestly something more, than that of an untimely, or severe death. The meaning of these two verses evidently is, that she who is described, will bring those who frequent her house, to the place in which those giants are confined, to remain with them. I will only advert to two or three other passages, which those who have learning and leisure, may consult in the Hebrew and Greek languages. Job, xxvi. 5, 6, "Dead things are formed from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof. Hell is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering." Prov. xv. 11, "Hell and destruction are before the Lord: how much more then the hearts of the children of men?" Isa. xiv. 9, "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead (Rephaim, giants) for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth." Ezek. xxxii. 18, "— unto the nether parts of the earth, with them that go down into the pit." (Hebrew, Gibborim, mighty men, giants. Septuagint, Gigantes.)

Having stated, and illustrated, as I believe, the true meaning of the passage, I would make one or two remarks.

1. A state of future punishment was taught and believed under the former dispensation. Both these facts have been denied: but the denial is against evidence. It is the result of feeling, rather than of knowledge.

2. The place or state of future punishment, is expressed in scripture by various words and phrases. In the Hebrew, it is expressed by the place of Rephaim and Gibborim, and sometimes by Sheol and Gehenna: in the Septuagint, by the place of the Gigantes, and sometimes by Hades: in the English, by Hell, the dead, congregation of the dead, lake of fire and brimstone. It is to be observed, that the place or state of future punishment, often takes its denomination from some place or circumstance rendered remarkable for the judgments of God upon notorious sinners; as the destruction of the old world by a flood; of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire and sulphur; as the valley of Hinnom, rendered execrable for the wickedness and cruelty which was there committed, and for the vengeance which God there executed upon his enemies. Let it be remembered, that other invisible and future things are denominated from things pertaining to the present world. It is no argument against the existence of future and invisible things, that they are denominated from something that has existed, or occurred on the earth. MINORIS.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE BENEFITS OF SYSTEM IN OUR RELIGIOUS CHARITIES.

A system of charity may be established by individuals for *themselves* alone; or by individuals *associated together*, with a view to advance important objects. Individuals may establish a system of charity for themselves, by resolving to bestow a particular

sum, every *week*. Thus the brethren, in the apostles' time, were directed to lay something by in store, every Lord's day. And many, in modern times, have agreed to bestow a cent, a penny, or perhaps a larger sum, every week in religious charity.—Or individuals may resolve to bestow, statedly, a particular *proportion* of their regular income. Numbers, now living, bestow a *tenth* of all their income, for objects connected with the general diffusion of the gospel.—Persons may establish a system of charity, by resolving to bestow a particular sum, or a particular proportion of their gains every *month*. Many in this way have made the contributions at the Monthly Concert, the medium of performing a regular course of religious charitable operations.—Persons may also establish a system of charity, by resolving to bestow a particular sum every *year*. This mode of giving, is at present so common, as to need no illustration.

Individuals, who are about establishing either of these systems of charity for themselves, may associate with others who are willing to do the same; and thus a regular charitable *Society* will be constituted. Where several of these societies exist in one vicinity, they may connect themselves together by a mutual agreement, and pour their united streams of charity into the treasury of the Lord. And where an object of great and common interest is presented, sufficient to excite a whole *community*, the whole may be divided into associations of this nature, and thus a general system of religious charity may be organized.

These remarks are intended merely to show what is *meant* by a system of charity. I proceed now to point out some of the *benefits* of system, in our religious charitable operations. And,

1. *More* will in this way *be given*, and with less embarrassment, than could be obtained by any other means. Little sums, regularly laid by in store, accumulate almost insensibly, and soon swell to a considerable amount. A few cents every week amount to *dollars* in the course of a year. Or a small proportion of the *gains* of any person, who is in flourishing circumstances, reserved statedly for charitable purposes, would in a little time amount to a sum that would probably surprise him. "A number of persons in the city of Boston have engaged to contribute a *dollar*, at every Monthly Concert; and they fulfil their engagement." And it is on this account chiefly, that the contributions at the Monthly Concert in Boston are more regular, and more productive, than at any place, perhaps in the christian world.—A gentleman, of whom I have read, "commenced business with very moderate prospects." He determined to set apart a certain proportion of every gain, to be sacredly "devoted to the service of God." And by this means he was enabled to support wholly, for some part of the time, and to assist constantly "in the support of an aged disciple" of Christ; "to contribute a weekly stipend for a poor and wretched family;" and in the course of six months to contribute *fifteen dollars* for the promotion of the general cause of religion. (See Miss. Herald, Vol. xix. p. 21.) These instances out of the many which might be mentioned, show how greatly and almost insensibly little sums, laid by for charitable purposes, increase; and make it

evident, that by bestowing our charities according to system, more will be given, and with less embarrassment, than could be obtained in any other way.

2. By bestowing our charities in this way, we shall be likely to *save* as much as we give. This may seem paradoxical at first; but both experience and reflection show it to be true. The gentleman referred to under the last particular, who, by devoting a certain proportion of his gains to charitable purposes, was enabled to accomplish so much good, adds, "I have no doubt that the deductions made on every gain, have been *saved* in carefulness and economy." It cannot be doubted, I think, that they were; and that every person who should make the same experiment, would come to the same result. He would find, that a systematical and consistent course of charitable operations, would be a means of saving him as much as he bestowed. There are good reasons why it should be so. First of all, he would, if under proper influence, secure for himself "the *blessing of God* which maketh rich," and which God has promised to bestow upon the consistently liberal. And besides; "whoever adopts a system, with respect to his *charities*, will be likely to do his other business systematically. Whoever is conscientious and exact in complying with *charitable* claims upon him, will be so in his other concerns; and this will lead to the truest and best economy. He who devotes one part of every gain to promote the cause of God in the world, will not be inclined to spend the other part thoughtlessly, extravagantly, or wickedly. The bare *fact* of bestowing charity, provided it result from a proper motive, must have a moral influence on the heart, which will be felt and exhibited in the whole manner of living. And if these acts of Christian charity are carried into the common business of life, and multiplied to the number of any person's gains, they must so bring into view, and hold up before the mind, the gospel motives and rules of purity, honesty, and active diligence, as greatly to prevent poverty, and the numberless disappointments in pecuniary concerns, to which all men are liable."—Such are some of the reasons which will satisfy every reflecting person, that by forming and pursuing a wise and proper system of religious charity, we shall actually *save* as much as we give. Our system of charity will probably be a *gain* to us, rather than a loss.

3. If the charities of the christian public are bestowed regularly and systematically, they can be *expended* to much better advantage. Every person, who is at all acquainted with business, knows, to how much better advantage he can employ his means, if he has them in his own hands, or if he is sufficiently satisfied what they are, and at what time he may expect them, than though he is left, on these subjects, in uncertainty and suspense. Every such person will see, therefore, to how much better purpose the charities of the christian public may be expended and applied, if they are bestowed according to some regular system. Those to whom they are entrusted, knowing very nearly what sums they are to expect, and when to expect them, will be able to form their plans with foresight and wisdom. They will be able to take the advantage of opportunities and circumstances, and to

turn the means entrusted to them to the best possible account.

4. The friends of religious charity, by being associated and organized according to some general system, will inspire *mutual confidence and strength.* The work of diffusing the gospel, though a noble work, is a *great* one; and were any individual engaged in it alone, or with only a few to countenance and assist him, he would be likely to be soon discouraged. Or were there *numbers*, who were engaged in it, but all labouring separately, without plan or union, the strength and confidence, which they ought mutually to impart, would be much diminished. But when all that *system* is given to the work of religious charity, of which it is susceptible—when its friends and promoters shall become regularly organized—each moving in his proper sphere, and doing his own work; then they will appear and *feel* like the army of the Lord of hosts, and will inspire mutual confidence and strength, and the noble work, in which they are engaged, will go forward with a steady and resistless progress.

5. System, among the friends and supporters of Missions, will serve to give confidence to the *Missionaries* themselves. Those beloved brethren and sisters, who have left their friends and homes, and perhaps their country, for the purpose of spreading the gospel among the heathen, are, under God, *dependent* on the Churches and Christians whom they have left behind. And this dependence, they must deeply *feel.* They feel that they are but the messengers of the Churches, and can do little more than these Churches, by their contributions, shall *enable* them to accomplish. With what interest, therefore, must they look to the contributions of the Churches? And with what confidence it must inspire them in their arduous work, to find their brethren at home, not only remembering them with affection and prayer, but establishing for their benefit a great and general system of religious charitable operation, thro' which the means of their usefulness are to be regularly supplied, and the donations of the Churches are to flow out in one continual and unbroken stream. Perceiving that, by such a measure, their earthly foundation is much strengthened, and their prospects of permanent usefulness increased; they will be encouraged to enlarge the sphere of their labours, to form and to execute new plans of benevolence, and to make longer and greater inroads upon the territory of the enemy of souls.

6. The friends and promoters of religious charity, by being systematically organized, can be more *directly addressed*—can be be made more *minutely acquainted* with circumstances—and their united strength can be more *readily called forth*, when special emergencies require it. If insulated or unconnected in their exertions, they will have no common centre of information and interest, and no individual among them will be able to make his voice heard, beyond the little circle in which he separately moves. But if their operations become digested into a regular system, their case will be much altered, and much improved. They then can be addressed, directly and at once, on any subject or occasion which is thought necessary. They can be made acquainted with the same facts, the same plans, the same encour-

agements and wants. The same calls can be issued, and the same motives be made to bear, on all at once. The promoters of religious charity would resemble, in this case, a well regulated army, moving steadily onward to their purpose, and directing their united energies against the enemies of their Lord, in sure and certain prospect of a speedy and decisive victory. It may be added,

7. By bestowing our charities according to system, they will be much more likely to be *continued*, and to be *permanent*. Without some regular digested system, even the best christians are liable to become remiss and negligent in their contributions. Other calls are made and are heeded, while the claims of the Lord's treasury are forgotten or disregarded. This accounts for it, that where there is no *system* of religious charity, the contributions are so fluctuating, and so little to be depended on. But when the charities of christians are reduced to a system, there is more reason to hope they will be regular and permanent. The system established, if it be entered into with zeal and spirit, may be expected to move on, in its appointed course. The stream of charity may be expected to run. The contributions of christians may be expected to be continued, and so far as practicable to be increased. In this way, the work of spreading the gospel may be expected to cease, only when the necessity for it ceases. It may be expected to go forward, with increasing energy and success, till "the knowledge of the Lord shall have covered the earth, as the waters do the seas."

I have here noticed several *advantages* which may be expected to result, from reducing the charities of the christian public as much as possible to a system. They are, in the general, obvious, and such as can scarcely fail to be realised. In most *other* things, the advantages of system are universally acknowledged. But there is perhaps nothing, to which system may be better applied, and from which the benefits of it will be greater, than the religious charitable operations of the present day.

It is justly matter of joy, therefore, to all who love the cause of truth, that these various operations are gradually resolving themselves, more and more, into a regular, systematical form. Benevolent individuals are uniting themselves with others of a kindred spirit; smaller associations are combining their efforts, and constituting larger ones; while these are conveying the collected treasures of their charity to some great and perhaps National institution. By this means, the christian community are coming to act in union and concert, in promoting some of the noblest objects, which ever were presented to the mind of man. They are combining their efforts in one vast enterprize, to spread the religion of their Saviour, and to make known his gospel to every creature. The Lord grant, that every attempt to systematize the charities of Christians, may be productive of all those advantages which have been brought into view.

It is hoped that every reader will regard himself as *bound*, to engage personally and zealously in that grand system of religious charitable operation, which is at present forming, and in some good degree formed. There is a station provided for every helper. There is something for each of

us to do. And it will be a comfort to us, when we come to die, to reflect, that we have stood in our lot, and done what we *could*, for the cause of our Saviour. And when Millenial scenes are ushered in, it will be an *honour* to us to be remembered, as those who have prayed and laboured to advance them. Our children will then love to say, one to another, "These are the glorious things, on which the hearts and hopes of our fathers and mothers were fixed—for which they prayed with many tears—and for which they cheerfully contributed of their store." Such a reflection will be of more value to our children, than an estate! They will choose rather to be known, as the descendants of those who have devoted themselves and their substance to the cause of God, than of those, who have amassed for them an earthly treasure. P.

For the Christian Magazine.

A SUBJECT PROPOSED.

Messrs. Editors.—I can, probably, do more to enrich your pages and to benefit your readers, by inducing others to write, than by writing myself. In attempting to do this, I would avail myself of the medium of your publication. No doubt many more would write than now do, if they could readily fix on a subject. In order to remove this obstacle, I would propose one to some of your correspondents, or to any others who may be willing to assist you in your labours. It is *repentance*. I have not often seen this subject discussed, in that clear and instructive manner, which its importance demands. Let any one who may undertake to write upon it, show what evangelical repentance is, and how it differs from every other christian grace. The reason of my being so particular, as to the manner of treating the subject, is, that your readers may have a clear and distinct view of this christian grace, and be able to see in what it differs from all others. They will then perceive whether they are the subjects of that repentance to which pardon and eternal life are promised. Many true, and even important things may be said in relation to the subject, and yet your readers may not be able to know in what it consists, nor wherein it differs from other graces enjoined in the gospel. The christian graces, though nearly allied, have each of them their peculiarities. It is the nature and peculiarity of repentance, which I wish to see exhibited in some of the future pages of the Christian Magazine.

I need not suggest, that if several papers be sent on the above subject, you will publish the one which, in your judgment, is the best, or the whole of them in successive numbers, if you think they deserve a place in your work. Allow me further to propose a short passage of scripture to some of your Biblical writers. It is the following: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" Rom. viii. 33.

If the solution of the subject and passage which I have named should meet your approbation, you may expect to hear again in the same way from

PHILO SIMPLICITAS.

REASONING IN SERMONS.

POWERFUL reasoning should be the soul of our sermons. Reasoning in eloquence, is like love in reli-

gion; without love you may have the shadow, but you cannot have the substance of religion.—Without love you are *nothing;* if you have not love, your virtue is only noise, it is only as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. In like manner in regard to eloquence, speak with authority, open all the treasures of erudition, give full scope to a lively and sublime imagination, and harmonize your periods; yet what will all your discourses without *reason* be? a noise, a sounding brass, a tinkling cymbal. You may confound, but you cannot convince; you may dazzle, but you cannot instruct; you may delight, but cannot hope to change, to sanctify, and to transform your hearers.

Saurin.

ENVY AND SLANDER.

THE old writers show no mercy to the envious man and to the slanderer. Every college boy, who has read Dalzel's book, remembers, probably, the dying wretch who was filled with envy, because he saw his fellow criminal crucified on a better cross than his own. This is extravagant. Nor less extravagant are the following lines, on one who is represented as having so much more poison than the most poisonous serpent, that the bite of the serpent was fatal to the reptile, not to the man. The thought is bitter enough.

A Slanderer felt an adder bite his side:
What follow'd from the bite? the *serpent* died.

Ch. Spectator.

DEPRAVITY.

THE conception of man does not consist in his acquiring wrong faculties; nor does the renewal of man consist in his having new faculties bestowed on him. His conception consists in the misdirection of his faculties, and his renewal consists in their being directed to proper objects.

Erskine.

Messrs Editors,—I send you for insertion in the Christian Magazine an Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp. For the benefit of those of your readers who are but imperfectly acquainted with ecclesiastical history, I will just state, that Ignatius succeded St. Peter as bishop of the church at Antioch, about the year of Christ 70. "Of his birth and parentage nothing is known; that he was an Asiatic there can be no doubt, and he was probably a Syrian." He was sentenced by the Emperor Trajan to be exposed to the wild beasts at Rome. On his way to Rome, where he suffered Martyrdom agreeably to the sentence of Trajan, he visited Polycarp, then bishop of Smyrna; and before he reached the place of his death, wrote him the following Epistle. Ignatius and Polycarp were fellow disciples of St. John. They were both eminent ministers of Christ, and martyrs to the cause which they espoused. Polycarp was condemned to the flames, and suffered at Smyrna about the year 167, not far from the hundredth year of his age. When it is considered that the following Epistle was written so near the Apostolic age, by one who was himself a disciple of John, under sentence of death for his attachment to Christ, and on his way to the place of his cruel sufferings, it cannot but be read with interest by all. Although it is a mere human production, and perhaps not perfectly correct in every sentiment which it contains; yet the pastoral fidelity which it exhibits, and

the solemn and interesting manner in which it enjoins upon another a faithful discharge of his pastoral duties, strongly recommend it to the attention of ministers.

EPISTLE OF IGNATIUS TO POLYCARP.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to Polycarp, bishop of the church of Smyrna, or rather to him who hath God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ for his bishop—Health.

Hearing of thy purpose which is founded and fixed in God, as upon a rock unmoveable, my heart is lifted up in thanksgiving, for that I am accounted worthy to behold thy face, which I earnestly wish to enjoy.

I beseech thee by the grace of God wherewith thou art clothed, that thou wouldest quicken thy course and exhort all men to be saved. Maintain thy place and office in constant attention to every part of it, whether carnal or spiritual. Be careful for unity, than which nothing is more excellent. Endure all men, that the Lord may endure thee. Be patient with all in the spirit of charity, as indeed thou art. Be constant in prayer. Entreat for a larger measure of understanding than thou hast. Watch always and guard against a drowsy spirit. Address thyself to all according to the help given to thee from above. Bear the infirmities of all men, as a perfect wrestler. The more labour, the greater gain. If thou love only the good and faithful disciples, what reward hast thou? But labour rather to overcome the disobedient by meekness. Every wound is not healed by the same treatment. "Be prudent as a serpent" in all things, and "simple as a dove." The time requireth thee, as a pilot requireth winds, and those who are tossed with tempests, the haven. Conduct thyself cautiously as the wrestler of God: the reward set before thee is immortality.

In every thing let me be unto thee in place of thine own soul, and my bonds which thou hast loved.

Be not affrighted by those, who, though they seem worthy of credit, teach other doctrines. Stand firm as an anvil which is beaten with the hammer. It is our duty to endure all things for God that he may endure us. Be more earnest than thou art. Consider the time, and wait for him who is beyond all time, immortal, invisible, yet made visible for our sakes, incapable of suffering, yet made capable of it for us, and who endured all things in our behalf.

See that the widows be not neglected: next to the Lord be thou their friend. Let nothing be done without thy will, neither do thou any thing without the will of God. Let assemblies be held more frequently. Inquire for all by name. Do not proudly despise slaves, whether male or female; yet see that they be not themselves puffed up, but let them serve more faithfully to the glory of God that they may obtain a better freedom from him. Neither let them seek to have their freedom purchased out of the public stock, lest they become slaves of covetousness.

Flee from evil arts, nay even forbear to mention them. Say unto my sisters that they must love God, and be contented with their husbands; likewise also charge my brethren in the name of the Lord Jesus, that they love their wives as Christ Jesus loved the church. If any one is able to remain in chastity to the honour

of his Lord, let him do it in humility: if he boasteth himself he is undone; and if he setteth up his own will against that of the bishop he is undone likewise. Marriages which are made in the Lord, and not according to concupiscence, ought to be made with the consent of the bishop. Let all things be done to the honor of God. Exhort them, hearken unto your bishop,* that God may hearken unto you. May my soul be with them who are obedient to the bishop, priests and deacons; and my part in God the same with theirs! and ye, brethren, labour, and run, and suffer with one accord, awake and sleep together as the joint ministers of God and common stewards of his mysteries. Please him under whose banners you fight, and whose wages you receive. Let none of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism remain upon you as armour, your faith as a helmet, your charity as a spear. Let your works be your pledges that ye may receive accordingly. Be long suffering one toward another that God may be the same to you.

And since the church which is at Antioch in Syria, enjoys peace as I am assured, through your prayers, by which my mind is composed to a more settled confidence in God, it is fitting, my dear Polycarp, blessed of God, to call an assembly to choose some beloved brother, an active man, who may be named the divine messenger, to go into Syria, and glorify your charity in Christ. A christian hath not power over himself, but is at the disposal of his God. And this surely when perfected will be God's work as well as yours; for I believe you are ready to every work which is agreeable to him.

But although I know your vehement affection for the truth, I have thought it good, notwithstanding to admonish you by letter. And since I was unable to write to all the churches, because I was suddenly called to set sail from the Troad to Naples according to the divine will, do thou who knowest the mind of God, write unto the neighbouring churches that they do the same thing; those who are able by messengers of their own, and those who are not by letters entrusted by others.

I salute you all, and namely the wife of Epitropus with her children, and all her house.

Salute my dear friend Attalus. Salute him who shall be accounted worthy to undertake the journey into Syria. May unceasing grace be with him, and with Polycarp who sends him. May you all evermore be strong in our God, Jesus Christ, through whom I pray that you may continue in unity and obedience. I salute Alee, a name greatly beloved. Farewell in the Lord.

* Bishop, in Ignatius' day, was "Primus inter pares."

ERASMUS AND LUTHER.

Erasmus skirmished, as it were, and with great success, against many of the auxiliaries of popery, but never once in his life did he look in the face what, according to Luther's judgment, was the real efficient enemy of Christ and his religion: never did he lay seige to the strong holds of self-righteousness. To pull down these with all his might was both the object and the practice of the Saxon reformer. Erasmus said many excellent things in an elegant way, concerning Christ

and the Gopel, concerning piety, purity of life, christian charity, meekness and peaceable temper. He exposed with great ability and with exquisite humour, and it may be truly added, with much advantage to the reformation, the ambition, covetousness, and ludicrous excesses of the clergy. Luther, who cordially agreed with him in all these just animadversions, went to the root both of the evil and the good. The depraved nature of man he taught as the root of the evil; contrition and humility, with a lively faith in the Redeemer, as the only cure of the reigning evil, and the only source of future good. While the former courted Popes and Cardinals, and temporized with them, fancying that reformation of ecclesiastical abuses might be brought about by mild and prudential management, the latter refused to make any sinful compromises, boldly opposed all antichristian notions, of merit of works, defended the important doctrine of purification by faith, and committed his cause to God. The doctrine of justification by faith was the article which, of all others, this great man had most at heart. If that were preserved, he conceived nothing could go materially wrong; if that were lost, nothing would go right; and in no great length of time he was convinced, that this fundamental doctrine could be established only on the ruins of popery. The opinions of Erasmus and Luther on this subject were substantially different, and in some important views the reverse of each other.—*Milnor.*

ANECDOTE OF LORD BOLINGBROKE.

It is much to be regretted that the works of the illustrious Calvin are so little read at the present day. Every person who is acquainted with the writings of our most eminent reformers, both in England and Scotland, such as Hooker, Cramner, Knox, &c. knows that no man was held in higher estimation by those distinguished characters than John Calvin, and no human compositions were more read and admired by them than his.—Nor was it only by persons of the above description that Calvin's writings were esteemed. The depth and ingenuity of his thoughts, the strength and accuracy of his reasoning, and the purity and elegance of his diction, have led many who have had no relish for the gospel to peruse his works.

The celebrated infidel, Lord Bolingbroke, was a remarkable instance of this; and the following anecdote in proof of it may be depended on. One day a Clergyman of his Lordship's acquaintance (Mr. C———h, who died Vicar of Battersea,) happened to call for him, when he was reading in Calvin's Institutes. "You have found me, said his Lordship, reading John Calvin. He was, indeed, a man of great parts, profound sense, and vast learning. He handles the doctrines of grace in a very masterly manner." "Doctrines of grace," replied the Clergyman, "the doctrines of grace have set all mankind together by the ears." "I am surprised to hear *you* say so," answered Lord Bolingbroke, *you* who profess to believe and *preach* christianity. Those doctrines are certainly the doctrines of the bible: and if I believed the bible, I *must* believe *them.* And let me seriously tell you, that I think the greatest miracle in the world is, the subsistence

of christianity, and its continued preservation as a religion, when the preaching of it is committed to the care of such an unchristian gentleman as you.

Rel. Monitor.

ANECDOTE OF THE REV. MR. VENN.

THE following anecdote is related by Sir Richard Hill.—"When the faithful minister of Christ, Mr. Venn, was vicar of Huddersfield, in Yorkshire, he told me, that a neighboring clergyman, the Rev. Dr. L——, one day addressed him nearly in the following words:—'Mr. Venn, I dont know how it is, but I should really think your doctrines of grace and faith were calculated to make all your hearers live in sin, and yet I must own that there is an astonishing reformation wrought in your parish; whereas, I dont believe I ever made one soul the better, though I have been telling them their duty for many years.' Mr. Venn smiled at the doctor's ingenuous confession, and frankly told him, 'he would do well to burn all his old sermons, and try what preaching Christ would do.'"

FREE INQUIRY.

THE advocates for the fashionable doctrine of free inquiry, urge the necessity or propriety of reading all sorts of writings in favour of every different opinion, that the conclusion which is drawn may be impartial. The observation of Bishop Hall on this subject is acute and seasonable:—"Let no man tell me of the distinction of that old Canonist: '*some things* (says he) we read lest they *should be neglected, as the Bible; some, lest they should be unknown, as Arts and Philosophy; some, that they may be rejected, as Heretical Books.*' True, but let *them* read that can reject, that can refute; we distrust not our cause, but their weak judgments. A good apothecary can make a good medicine, of a strong poison; must children, therefore, be allowed that dose?"

Pharisaism and Christianity.

A CLERGYMAN'S LIFE.

To a person who regretted to the celebrated Dr. Samuel Johnson, that he had not been a clergyman, because he considered the life of a clergyman an easy and comfortable one, the Doctor made this memorable reply: "The life of a conscientious clergyman is not easy. I have always considered a clergyman, as the father of a larger family than he is able to maintain. No Sir, I do not envy a clergyman's life, as an easy life; nor do I envy the clergyman that makes it an easy life."

MISTAKE CORRECTED.

WE often hear it said, that the children of good people are as bad as any. This is a palpable falsehood. On the contrary, the church has been principally kept up, in every age, by the seed of the faithful. A minister of the gospel who had served the same congregation for nearly half a century, once assured the writer, that three fourths of the communicants then in his church, were, to his knowledge, the children of communicants; yet the half of his congregation, probably, had never been communi-

cants. There is, however, a number, (and taken collectively, a very considerable number,) of the most profligate and abandoned of men, who are the offspring of the most eminent of saints. What then, does this dispensation teach us? On the one hand, it plainly, and forcibly teaches the duty, and advantage of religious instruction and education, and God's favour to his people in answering their prayers, in blessings on their descendants. On the other hand, it not only teaches the divine sovereignty in choosing its own subjects for grace and glory, but also, that true religion does not depend on the natural constitution of either body or mind; because those, who derive such constitution from their parents, are sometimes, totally different from, and opposite to them, in moral qualities, and in devout dispositions and pious habits. It teaches, in a word, that the children of God are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Mass. Miss. Magazine.

Missionary Intelligence.

TABULAR VIEW
OF PROTESTANT MISSIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD,
IN THEIR GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER.

Compiled from the London Missionary Register for January and February 1825, and from the Boston Missionary Herald.

	Stations.	Missionaries.	Native Assistants.	Pupils in Schools.	Members of the Church.
Western Africa,	19	26	23	3,460	603
South Africa,	27	50	6	683	367
African Islands,	3	7	1	245	
Mediterranean,	4	16			
Black and Caspian Seas,	3	14			
Siberia,	1	3			5
China,	1	1	1		
India beyond the Ganges,	5	11	1	150	
India within the Ganges,	56	120	240	22,240	495
Ceylon,	18	28	29	12,164	381
Indian Archipelago,	15	21		250	
Austral Asia, and Polynesia,	35	63	93	7,586	2,000*
South American States,	1	2			
Guiana and the West Indies,	59	104		2,322	33,680†
N. American Indians,	35	88		900	200
Labrador,	3	14			193
Greenland,	4	16			
	289	584	394	50,000	37,919

The above tabular view is as perfect as can well be expected. Still it is very defective in some of its parts; especially in reference to the number of Native Assistants employed, the number of Pupils in the schools, and the number of Communicants in the Churches. In several instances, in the principal survey from which the table was compiled, the *Native Assistants* connected with missionary stations are said to be "many," and in other instances it is only stated

* Mr. Ellis estimates the number of Communicants in the Society Islands at 2,000.

† Upwards of 25,000 of these are coloured people in connexion with the Methodist denomination. About 4,000 are members of the Baptist Church.

in general that there are native assistants. The whole number may be 500.—In estimating the number of *Pupils* we have adhered to the documents embodied in the above named surveys. But it falls far short of the truth; as may be seen from the following fact. In a general view of the Wesleyan Missions in Ceylon, it is said, on the authority of one of the missionaries in that Island, that the whole number of pupils connected with those missions, is between 9,000 and 10,000: but, in the survey of the several stations, owing to the want of documents, we find the mention of only about 2,000. Other similar instances of deficiency might be pointed out. Nearly a hundred schools were also mentioned, without any notice of the number of scholars which they contain. Probably the whole number of pupils in the schools established by missionaries, falls not much short of 100,000.—But the deficiency in the statement respecting the number of *Communicants* in the mission churches, is believed to be far greater, than in respect either to the Native Assistants, or the pupils. From but few stations do any returns appear. Had we time to make, ourselves, an extensive examination of documents, we might doubtless approximate much nearer to the real number of those, who, from unevangelized nations, have publicly professed the Christian faith. The Moravians estimate the converts connected with their missions at 30,000.—It should also be added, that in the above table all the male labourers at the missionary stations are reckoned: but the ordained missionaries amount to but little more than 400.—*Miss. Her.*

Religious Intelligence.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

Massachusetts.—During the late winter, and a part of the preceding autumn, there has been a pleasing revival in the West Parish of Taunton. As many as fifty persons, there is reason to hope, have shared in the saving influence of the Holy Spirit. Though all the praise is to be ascribed ultimately to God; yet the Pastor of the church is worthy of our grateful consideration, for the judicious and faithful manner in which he has proceeded in the critical and glorious season of the revival.

New-York State.—Extract of a letter to the Editors of the Recorder and Telegraph, from a gentleman in Oneida County, N. Y.

"I have just returned from attending a session of our Presbytery, and a more interesting meeting I never attended; and so it was remarked by the oldest preachers. The Lord in mercy is carrying on revivals in a most powerful manner in many places. Among those that are blessed with the outpouring of the gracious spirit, are Rome, Westmoreland, Trenton, Western, Lee, Mount Vernon, Verona, Boonville, Camden, Sangersfield, and Vernon-Centre. It does seem that there never was a time like the present, since the day of Pentecost; such wonderful displays of sovereign grace, such multitudes flocking to the cross. Let all the glory be given to God."

In the town of Pottsham, a work of grace began in St. Lawrence Academy, and spread into the town. As the fruits of this work, about sixty subjects have united with the Presbyterian church in that place.

The town of Governeur has been favoured with a very extensive revival. It is supposed that between two and three hundred have there experienced a saving change of heart.

In one district of the town of Canton a revival has commenced, and twelve or fifteen are rejoicing in hope, while others are subjects of deep and pungent convictions.

In a district comprising a part of the towns of Pierpont and Parishville, a revival has commenced, and is spreading.

In several other towns there are favourable intimations of a revival.—*West. Rec.*

Sandwich Islands.—It is stated in a letter written by Mr. Ruggles, one of the American Missionaries, that, about the first of Jan. 1825, a visible change seemed to take place in the minds of several of the principal chiefs in these islands, more decidedly in favour of religion than was ever before manifest. "It is a singular circumstance," says the same writer, "that the first revival of religion at the Sandwich Islands commenced on four different Islands, in five different stations at the same time—the same year, the same month, and I may say the same week. Several about that time, came out boldly, and decidedly on the side of the Lord, and these were mostly chiefs of the highest influence." We learn from the Assistant Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners, that on the 30th of May, 133 individuals on Honoruru alone, had enrolled their names as desirous of being fully taught the word of God, and of obeying him so far as they might be enabled to know his will. At a meeting of the church and congregation on the 5th of June, ten persons, including several chiefs of the first rank, made a public relation of their religious experience. In August, nine chiefs were propounded for admission into the church. Among these nine, were the Regent of the Islands, and the favourite Queen of the late king Tamahamaha, a woman of great power and influence. It appears from various accounts, that the number of those, who profess to be friends of Christ, embrace the principal influence on these Islands. "There is great reason to wonder, as well as rejoice, at what God has there done."

At Sea.—We have been favoured with a copy of a letter from a mercantile gentleman of eminent piety, dated near Calcutta, July 2, from which we make the following extract.

Soon after we sailed I found we had a very profane crew. Such horrible depravity as was exhibited during the several first days, I never before witnessed. My feelings were much excited, and I determined on seizing an opportunity of speaking to the crew in a body, and distributing some religious Tracts and other publications. While looking out for such an opportunity I found a convenient agent in promoting my purposes in a member of the crew, who, I ascertained was a sensible and devout christian. Our designs were soon providentially carried into execution, and, wonderful to tell, were received with great seriousness. Having obtained the countenance of the captain, I continued to press the sub-

ject upon their attention at every opportunity. A great change in the manners of the men was very discoverable, and your heart will burn with gratitude to the Father of all mercies, when I tell you *every* individual of the crew is now become a subject of conviction or hope. A more affecting or pleasing scene I think I never witnessed. No other subject, except the greatest of all subjects, is spoken of on board. Some are singing praises, while some are anxiously inquiring the way of salvation. The captain, one of the mates, the cook and the boy, are among those who are rejoicing in hope. I have not time, by the opportunity offered, to enter into details. We have been much favoured during the passage with good weather.

Mar. Mag.

Obituary Notices.

DEATH OF MR. FISK.

It is painful to learn, by an arrival here from Smyrna, that the Rev. Pliny Fisk, a most valuable missionary of the American Board, is no more. He died at Beyrout, near Mount Lebanon, on Sabbath morning, Oct. 23, 1825, while with Messrs. Bird and Goodell, after a sickness of twelve days, occasioned by a fever. Thus have the two first American missionaries to the Holy Land, closed their labours on earth, and gone to receive their reward.

Mr. Fisk was born in Shelburne, Mass.—prepared for College with the Rev. Moses Hallock, of Plainfield—obtained his public education at Middlebury, Vt.—his theological at Andover—and embarked for Western Asia in 1819. We are informed that a full and most interesting account of the circumstances attending his sickness and death has been received at the Missionary Rooms, and will appear in the April number of the Herald.

A letter from the Rev. William Goodell, another Missionary to Palestine, under date of October 25th, says, "That dear brother of ours, that faithful friend, that truly devoted and useful Missionary is no more! Precisely at three o'clock on Sabbath morning, Oct. 23d, he entered, as we trust, upon a Sabbath, which will never end. We accompanied him to the Jordan of death, and we believe he passed safely through its deep waters to the promised land—to a better country, even an heavenly.—He closed his eyes, laid his hands upon his bosom, and expired without a struggle, after twelve days illness from fever.—Surely the hand of God hath touched us, and our tears cannot be soon dried away.—You also will feel and weep; and so will the ten thousands who have known and loved him; and thousands who have not seen his face in the flesh. It is a public loss, but God knoweth all our sorrows, for his own hand hath caused them, and into his compassionate bosom let us pour them all. May the affliction be sanctified to us!"

Boston Rec. and Tel.

DEATH OF MRS. KNIGHT.

Died, at Nellore, in Ceylon, on the 26th of April, Mrs. Sarah Knight, wife of Rev. Joseph Knight, of the Church Missionary Society. Mrs. K. was the sister of Mr. Bardwell, formerly mis-

sionary at Bombay, and went to Ceylon as the wife of the late Mr. Richards. She was married to Mr. Knight in September 1823. —A late number of the London Missionary Register contains the following notice of her death.

The Rev. Joseph Knight, of Nellore, in Ceylon, has not long enjoyed the benefits of his marriage with the widow of the late Mr. Richards. She had suffered for some time under inflammation of the lungs, which became alarming about a month before her death; the disease seemed to have yielded to the operation of powerful medicines, when she was attacked with violent diarrhœa, which carried her off in about thirty hours. She has left an infant daughter by her last marriage, and two children by her first. Mr. Knight writes, in deep affliction, on the 10th of May.

"On finding that her end was near, she gave her dying advice with great earnestness, to all connected with the station. She was about thirty-two years of age; and had been actively employed in the work of missions for about eight years. She conversed in the native language with facility; and delighted much in giving instructions to the youth and others of her sex. May the Lord cheer us with divine consolations; and abundantly make up our loss, by pouring out his Holy Spirit on us, and on the heathen around."

DEATH AND CHARACTER OF DR. BOGUE.

DIED, at Bridgton, England, Oct. 25th, after a few days illness, the Rev. DAVID BOGUE, D. D., of Gosport, in the 77th year of his age. He had been more than 46 years Pastor of the Church of Protestant Dissenters at Gosport, and was Principal of the Missionary Seminary at that place. At the time of his death he was on a visit to Bridgton to attend the anniversary of the "Sussex Auxiliary Missionary Society."

A friend who was personally acquainted with Dr. Bogue, has obligingly furnished us (says the Missionary Herald) with the following notice of him.

From the important station, which he filled, and the extensive influence, which he exerted among Protestant Dissenters in England, his death will be most sensibly felt, and deeply lamented.

He might justly, be ranked at the head of the denomination of Christians, to which he belonged.

He was one of the first promoters and founders of the *London Missionary Society;* a Society, the extent of whose influence can be known only in eternity.

The first address to Christians, with a view to the formation of this Society, was from his pen; and the interest, which he felt in all its concerns, continued with unabating and increasing vigor, to the hour of his death.

He was early appointed by that Society, in conjunction with their late highly esteemed Treasurer, Mr. Hardcastle, and Dr. Waugh, who is now living on a mission of inquiry, to a neighboring kingdom, which had been the prey of an atheistical philosophy; and the Essay, which he prepared for circulation in that country, on the inspiration of the New-Testament, exceeds all praise.

In addition to this effort of his mind, he is known to the public as the author of discourses on the Millennium, a work which well deserves an edition from the American press; and of the History of Dissenters, which was prepared by him, in conjunction with Dr. Bennet of Rotherham.

Several occasional sermons have also met the warm approbation of the religious public.

As a *Preacher*, Dr. Bogue was peculiarly impressive. His manner was uncommonly dignified, and, his Discourses full of thought and weighty matter.

Plain, simple and unaffected, he never failed to command the attention of his auditory; and it must have been their own fault, if his congregations were not instructed and edified by his ministrations.

As a *Speaker* on public occasions, he was always listened to with the deepest interest: and, while the corruscations of a more youthful and lively fancy attracted the applause of the less discerning part of the audience, the strong sense and manly eloquence of Dr. Bogue were received with marked and decided approbation by the serious and judicious portion of the assembly.

As a *Man*, and a *Christian*, Dr. Bogue was courteous and friendly, modest and unassuming. The kindly smile with which he greeted his friends, and the almost apostolic benediction which he bestowed upon them at parting, will never be forgotten by those who enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance.

In his political feelings, Dr. Bogue was ardently attached to the cause of rational liberty; though no one knew better than himself to distinguish between liberty and licentiousness, and more highly to appreciate the advantages of a mild, but energetic government.

In the civil, literary and religious institutions of our rising country, he took the liveliest interest; and delighted to converse on our bright and brightening prospects.

His merit as a Scholar and Divine was appreciated in this, as well as in his own country. In the year 1809, he received a Diploma of Doctor in Divinity from Yale College in Connecticut.

In his person, Dr. Bogue was above the common size—commanding and dignified in his appearance—with features strongly marked, but tempered with the most benevolent expression.

To have been favoured with his friendship, and to have seen him within a few months of his translation to his Master's Kingdom, the writer of this brief obituary will ever esteem among the happiest circumstances of his life.

J. C.

Ordinations and Installations.

Jan. 11,—Rev. Manning Ellis was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Brooksville, Me. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Smith.

Jan. 18,—Rev. Isaac Willey was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Rochester, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Tyler, President of Dartmouth College.

Feb. 2,—Rev. Francis H. Case was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Goshen, Ct. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Beecher.

Feb. 2,—Rev. Benjamin Dean, of Westmoreland, was ordained in Swanzey, N. H. to the work of an Evangelist.

Feb. 14,—Rev. Jarvis Gilbert was ordained at Fairhaven, Vt. to the work of an Evangelist, by the

Rutland Association. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Drewry.

Feb. 22,—Rev. Luke A. Spofford, was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Brentwood, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Burnham, of Pembroke.

March 1,—Rev. Reuben Mason was installed Pastor over the Church and Society in Glover, Vt. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Fairbank, of Littleton, N. H.

March 15,—Rev. Joseph Underwood was ordained Pastor the 1st Congregational Church New Sharon, Me. Sermon Rev. Mr. Thurston, of Winthr

March 16,—Rev. Isaac Rogi was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Far ington, Me. Sermon by Rev. I Gillet, of Hallowell.

March 22,—Rev. Lyman Bee er, D. D. was installed Pastor the Hanover Church, Bost Sermon by Rev. Dr. Humphr

Poetry.

ALL THINGS ARE OF GOD.

Thou art, Oh God! the life and light
Of all this wondrous world we see;
Its glow by day, its smiles by night,
Are but reflections caught from thee.
Where'er we turn, thy glories shine,
And all things fair and bright are thine.

When day, with farewell beam, delays
Among the opening clouds of even,
And we can almost think we gaze,
Through golden vistas into heaven;
Those hues that make the sun's decline
So soft, so radiant, Lord! are thine.

When night, with wings of starry gloom,
O'ershadows all the earth and skies,
Like some dark, beauteous bird, whose plume
Is sparkling with unnumbered eyes;—
That sacred gloom, those fires divine,
So grand, so countless, Lord! are thine.

When youthful spring around us breathes,
Thy Spirit warms her fragrant sigh;
And every flower, the summer wreaths,
Is born beneath that kindling eye:
Where'er we turn, thy glories shine,
And all things fair and bright are thine.

Thomas

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND READERS.

C. F.—J. J.—F.—J. A. G. and Bellamy, are received.

☞ In the March No. of the Magazine p. 77, l. 10, from the t *interesting* should have been *increasing;* and in l. 12, same pa *interested* should have been *increasing.*

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. MAY, 1826. No. 5.

For the Christian Magazine.

MEN OUGHT ALWAYS TO PRAY.

PRAYER has always been so disagreeable to a depraved heart, that men have exerted all their ingenuity to justify themselves in neglecting this reasonable duty. Some argue against it, from the nature and perfections of the Deity. They say he knows too much to need to be informed of their wants. They say he is too good to need to be asked or solicited to bestow what he sees best to bestow. And they say he is too immutable to be moved by their prayers or supplications. From these premises they draw the conclusion, that they are under no necessity or obligation to pray for divine favours. But they more generally plead their own depravity and inability, as an excuse for restraining prayer before God. They say they are forbidden to pray wrong, and they are unable to pray right; therefore it is not their duty to pray at all. Now, if there were any weight in any of these objections against the duty of prayer, Christ must have known it; for he knows what was in God and what was in man. But from a perfect knowledge of the character and perfections of God, and of the character and condition of men, and of their mutual relations to each other, he drew this just and important conclusion, "that men *ought* always to pray, and not to faint." In illustrating the sentiment contained in this conclusion, I shall show what prayer is—prove it to be a duty incumbent on all men—and point out when it ought to be performed.

1. What is true prayer?

According to a common and well known definition, "prayer is the offering up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will." This definition seems to be a little deficient; because it does not distinguish a *good*, from a *bad* prayer. A man destitute of grace, may offer up desires for things agreeable to the will of God. He may pray for life, or health, or holiness; all which are things agreeable to the divine will, in their own nature; but his desires for such things are altogether selfish and criminal. A better definition of prayer may be given in these words: Prayer is the offering up to God holy or proper desires for things agreeable to his will. By desires here, we are to understand, all virtuous or benevolent affections of the heart, whether holy love, or holy fear, or holy gratitude, or holy joy, or holy sorrow. There is no gracious affection but what may be expressed, either in adoration, confession, petition, intercession, or thanksgiv-

ing. True prayer consists in the expression of right affections. Expression, I say, because desires or affections, which are *not expressed*, cannot be considered as prayer. In the most secret and spontaneous ejaculations, the suppliant puts his desires or feelings into words. There is, therefore, a real distinction between prayer and mere meditation. Men may meditate upon God, or Christ, or any divine or religious object, without using any language at all; but they cannot pray in secret, private, or public, without clothing their thoughts and affections in words. It is only in words, that the affections of the heart can be offered up to God in prayer. So that one thing necessarily implied in prayer, is an actual *expression* of the desires of the heart, respecting *proper* objects. No person may desire what he knows God will not grant, nor ask him to alter his designs, or work a miracle in favour of himself, or others. But when men have *proper* feelings towards *proper* objects, they may express them before God, and their expression of them will be a true, sincere prayer. But in asking for any favour at the hands of God, with propriety, submission is always implied, or a willingness that God should grant, or deny it. There is no difference in this respect, between asking for private or public, temporal or spiritual blessings. We never know before hand, what favours it is best, all things considered, that God should grant or deny, and we should always ask with unreserved submission. And no person, in the exercise of right affections, can pray for any thing absolutely, that is, without a desire that God should either grant or deny what he requests, as shall be most for his glory. This is a short, but we believe, a full and just description of such a prayer as is always acceptable to God. I now proceed to prove,

2. That it is the duty of all men to pray, or to offer up *proper* desires to God, for things agreeable to his will. Our Saviour taught this doctrine in the most plain and appropriate terms. "He spake a parable to this end, that men *ought* always to pray, and not to faint." *Ought* is the most proper term to express *duty* or moral obligation. There is nothing but duty, that men *ought* to do, and therefore whatever they *ought* to do is *duty*. Christ says *men*, that is *all* men, without distinction of character, ought to pray. And that this is true, will appear from the following considerations:—

From the nature of things. There is a mutual, and immutable relation between God and all mankind. He is their Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor, and they are his dependent and rational creatures. This mutual relation lays all men under moral obligation to feel and express their constant and entire dependence on God for life, for health, for holiness, and for happiness. They are indebted to him for all the good they have ever enjoyed, and are dependent on him for all the good they shall ever need in time to come. This they are under moral obligation to feel and to express. If they feel as they ought to feel, they will love God for the perfections of his nature, the blessings of his providence, and the gifts of his grace; and offer up to him the gratitude, the submission, and homage of their hearts. While God remains what he is, and they remain what they

are, they must be under indispensable moral obligations to give him the worship and glory which are due to his name. As all men stand in the same relation to God, whether they are holy or unholy, obedient or disobedient; so their obligation to prayer cannot be dissolved. It is founded in their relation to God, which must remain as long as they exist free, accountable, moral agents. Neither the goodness nor badness of their hearts, destroys their moral agency and accountability, and consequently cannot destroy their moral and immutable obligation to offer up proper desires to God, for things agreeable to his will. Their obligation to this duty does not depend upon their disposition, but upon their rational capacity. The bare knowledge of their relation to and dependence on God, creates a moral obligation to glorify him as God, by paying him the supreme homage of their hearts. So that sinners are as naturally, constantly and immutably bound to pray to God, as saints are. As prayer is a duty which results from the nature of things, so it is binding on all men of all ages, characters, and conditions.

The bare light of nature teaches that all men ought to pray. Whatever is right or wrong in the nature of things may be discovered to be so, by the light of nature. The light of nature teaches all men that murder is a crime. The barbarians who saw the viper on Paul's hand, supposed he was a murderer and ought not to live. It is right in the nature of things to speak the truth, and all men may discover it to be so, by the light of nature. And in the same way all nations have discovered prayer to be a duty. The mariners with Jonah, in a storm at sea, called upon him, and every one, to call upon his God. Though they were heathens, yet the light of nature taught them that every man ought to pray to the being whom he acknowledged to be his God. As every nation which has been discovered in the most remote parts of the earth, have acknowledged some divinity or supreme invisible power, so all nations unite in the belief of the duty of prayer. Whether they ever would have acknowledged the excellence of any divine being, had it not been for traditon, is another question. But since they have acknowledged the existence of a Deity, they have discovered, by the light of nature, that prayer is a duty, which they owe to him. Though mankind have greatly, if not generally, neglected to call upon God, it is no evidence that they have not believed this to be their duty; for we know they have neglected all other known duties. It is sufficient to know, that all men in distress, and beyond the reach of human help, have always been disposed to call upon their God for aid and relief. This universal consent of all nations in all ages, to the duty and obligation of prayer, is a strong evidence that it is founded in the nature of things, discoverable by the light of nature, and binding upon every individual of the human race. Besides,

It is not only founded in the nature of things and discoverable by the light of nature, but expressly and abundantly enjoined in the word of God. David calls upon all men to worship their Maker. "O come, let us worship, and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." Christ said, "It is written, thou shalt wor-

ship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." And he himself taught, "that men ought always to pray, and not to faint." Again he said to those whom he instructed, "Watch ye, therefore, and *pray always.*" And it is enjoined upon men "to be instant in prayer, to continue in prayer, to pray without ceasing, and to pray always with all prayer and supplication." Paul says, "I will that all men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." The bible not only abounds with such plain injunctions upon all men to pray, but enforces the duty by the examples of the greatest and best of men. Noah, Job, and Daniel, gave themselves to prayer; and so did Moses, David, and Samuel, together with the prophets, apostles, and even Christ himself. These examples have the sanction of divine approbation, and carry the weight of divine authority. It is difficult to conceive, that any should read and believe the bible, and not believe that they are divinely required to make known their wants to God, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving. All men are bound to pray, by every kind of obligation, by which they are bound to perform any other duty. It only remains to show,

3. When they ought to pray. Christ says *always*, and so says the Holy Spirit in several passages which have been cited. But none can suppose, that such expressions are to be understood in the strictest sense, and therefore they need some explanation. They may mean that men ought always to live in a praying frame, or live in the continual exercise of such virtuous and pious affections, as may be properly expressed in prayer. Or they may rather mean, that prayer is not a mere *occasional*, but a *perpetual* duty, which ought to be constantly performed from day to day, through the whole course of life. This is most certainly true, and leads me to observe,

That men ought to pray *whenever* they become acquainted with God. Multitudes of mankind live and die without the knowledge of the true God, and indeed of any other. But it is always absurd to pray to an unknown God, either in a heathen, or christian land. And among those who live in a christian land, some come to the knowledge of God much sooner than others. Children know some duties much earlier than the duty of prayer; and some, whose religious education is neglected, live long without knowing God, and the duty of calling upon his name. The time to begin to pray, therefore, is as soon as any come to the knowledge of God, whether in childhood, youth, or riper years. The knowledge of God, gives the knowledge of the duty of prayer, and as soon as any know this duty, they are under moral obligation to perform it. If men ought *always* to pray, then they ought to pray as soon as they are capable of it; and they are capable of it, as soon as they have any just conception of the being and perfections of God, in whom they live, and move, and have their being. Did parents but properly instruct their children, with respect to religion, they would early become acquainted with God, and feel their obligations to call upon his name. And as soon as any, however young, become acquainted with God, they ought immediately to go to God

and pour out their hearts before him in grateful, humble, penitential prayer.

Men ought to pray every day. We know that there were morning and evening sacrifices appointed under the Law, at which times, the people stood in the outer court praying. There appears to be the same propriety in praying morning and evening under the Gospel, as under the Law. David said to God, "Every day will I bless thee." And again he said, "My voice shalt thou hear in the morning, O Lord, in the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee, and will look up." Every person, every morning, has occasion to look up to God for his guidance, protection and influence through the day; and in the evening, he has the same occasion to give thanks to God for all the favours he has bestowed upon him the day past. Daily duties and daily mercies call for daily prayers and praises. What is proper for a person, in this case, is equally proper for a family. Every family are dependent on God every day for family favours, and need to seek to God every morning, and thank God for them every evening. The prayer which Christ taught his disciples to use every day, was evidently designed as a model of social family prayer, in which he enjoins it upon every family to pray for pardon, and every other blessing which they need every day. Every family, whether rich or poor, high or low, have need to pray every day, "give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." These are daily blessings, which call for daily prayers and thanksgivings. God has, either directly or indirectly, clearly pointed out morning and evening as the proper seasons for men to come into his presence every day, and ask for his mercy. These seasons ought to be held sacred, and punctually observed for secret and social prayer. No common business, nor company, can be a sufficient excuse for neglecting, either morning or evening, the duty of either secret or social prayer. And none, who properly realize their dependence on God, and the endearing obligation they are under to the Father of mercies, will easily forego the duty and privilege of calling upon him at the seasons he has appointed, and they have devoted to religious services.

Men ought to pray *occasionally* as well as *daily*. God often calls men to this duty, by the peculiar dispensations of providence. He sometimes smiles, and sometimes frowns, on individuals, on families, and on large communities. Such signal dispensations, whether merciful or afflictive, ought to be devoutly and prayerfully acknowledged. When God bestows any great and unexpected favour upon any one, he has just occasion to thank and praise him for the peculiar expression of his goodness. On such an occasion David said, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord." Though a day of prosperity be a day of joy, it is no less a day of danger, which calls for prayer as well as gratitude. But if a day of uncommon prosperity calls for occasional prayer, much more a day of uncommon adversity. And so the scripture represents it. God says to every man, "Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt

glorify me." And the apostle James says, "Is any man afflicted, let him pray." Good men of old, made a practice of praying occasionally. We find many instances of their occasional prayers recorded in scripture, for the instruction and admonition of future ages. Jacob made an occasional prayer, in a time of extreme danger and distress. When his brother Esau pursued him, with full intent to destroy him and his family, he wrestled with God and prevailed. "And Jacob said, O God of my father Abraham, and the God of my father Isaac, the Lord which said unto me, Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred, and I will dwell with thee: I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which thou hast shewed unto thy servant: for with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands. Deliver me I pray thee from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau: for I fear him, lest he will come and smite me, and the mother with the children. And thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude." This was a prayer of faith in the express promises of God, and was most graciously answered. When God proposed it to Moses, to destroy Israel for making and worshipping the golden calf, he expected that Moses would intercede for them, and therefore said to him, "Let me alone, that I may consume them, and I will make of thee a great nation." But Moses besought the Lord his God, on that distressing occasion, and said, "Lord, why dost thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt, with great power, and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people: Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swearest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven; and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. And the Lord *repented* of the evil which he thought to do unto his people." I might mention the occasional prayer of David, when he saw the sword of the angel of the Lord drawn to destroy Jerusalem, and when he fled from his rebellious son Absalom. I might mention the occasional prayers of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, and especially the occasional prayers of Christ. All these instances teach us the propriety and importance of praying to God, on all extraordinary occasions of prosperity and adversity. All men ought to observe the operations of God in his providence, and this will teach them when and how they ought to pray on extraordinary occasions. Let their feelings and prayers always correspond with the dispensations of providence, in granting or taking away both temporal and spiritual, public and private favours. And if they pray always, with all prayer and supplications, from day to day, they will always remember and never forget nor neglect to call upon God, under the uncommon smiles and frowns of providence.

I shall close the present com-

munication with a single inference.

If all men ought always to pray, then none ought ever to direct them *not* to pray. It is said, that some preachers, either expressly or implicitly, direct sinners not to pray. But I know of but one denomination of christians in the world, who maintain it as a principle and duty to direct sinners not to pray. These are the small sect called Sandemaneans. They do, in their writings and preaching, teach sinners that they ought not to pray, or that they are not bound to pray, until they cordially embrace the gospel. All other denominations of christians, as far as I know, maintain the principle, that all men, whether saints or sinners, ought to pray. It is true indeed, that Calvinists are often charged with denying the duty of sinners to pray, and with exhorting them to refrain from it. But I am acquainted with no Calvinists, whether more strict or more moderate, that deny the duty of sinners to pray, and teach them to neglect the duty. The truth of the case is, that all Calvinists maintain the doctrine of divine decrees, the doctrine of total depravity, and the doctrine of regeneration by the special grace of God. But the Anti-Calvinists say, that if the doctrine of divine decrees be true, sinners have nothing to do; or if the doctrine of total depravity be true, it is naturally impossible for sinners to do any thing right; or if the doctrine of regeneration be true, it is naturally impossible for sinners to love or obey God. From these premises, they draw their own conclusion, that all Calvinists deny that sinners ought to pray, and implicitly tell them to neglect prayer. But strict Calvinists deny this conclusion. They say that neither the doctrine of decrees, nor the doctrine of total depravity, nor the doctrine of regeneration, destroys the free agency of sinners, or lays them under a natural inability to do all that God requires of them in the law and in the gospel, and accordingly, they expressly exhort sinners to pray, and do every thing else that he requires them to do. It is true, the moderate Calvinists, in explaining the doctrine of decrees, the doctrine of total depravity, and the doctrine of regeneration, do say some things, which imply that these doctrines lay sinners under a *natural* inability to pray, or to do any thing else in cordial obedience to God; from which, sinners draw the consequence, that they have nothing to do. But however inconsistent these moderate Calvinists may be, they nevertheless universally exhort sinners to pray, repent, believe, and do every other duty. It is not true of any Calvinists, that they deny that sinners ought to pray, or that they exhort them to neglect this, or any other duty. It must be allowed that preachers are often faulty in not explaining to sinners in what sense, they *cannot*, and in what sense they *can* pray aright. They are, indeed, *morally unable* to pray penitently; but they are *naturally* able to pray penitently; they ought to be *exhorted* to pray penitently, and warned against praying impenitently. This is the scripture mode of exhorting sinners to pray; and this is the mode in which strict Calvinists do exhort and warn sinners in respect to the duty of prayer.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO THE PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS.

THE question, whether all true believers will be saved or not, is peculiarly interesting and important. It is well known that upon this subject, there are different opinions. While some cherish the belief that all, who have been once united to Christ by faith in his name, will persevere in holiness and obtain salvation; there are others who indulge the disheartening apprehension that many of this description will entirely lose their christian character, and finally receive their portion with hypocrites and unbelievers. It is the design of the present communication to prove, from the testimony of scripture, that all true believers will eventually be saved. The passages which support this truth may be divided into two classes: Those which expressly assert it, and, Those which plainly imply it.

Among those which expressly assert the fact, that all true believers will be saved, are the following: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "Verily, verily, I say unto you," said Christ to the Jews, "he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Here it is asserted, that whosoever believeth on Christ shall not perish, but, shall have everlasting life; that he who heareth the word of Christ, and believeth on him that sent him, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Now is not this as much as to say, that every true believer shall be saved? Indeed, in the above quotations, is not the fact that every true believer shall be saved, *repeatedly* asserted? Does not Christ assert this truth when he says, "Whosoever believeth on him, shall not *perish?*" Does he not assert it again when he says of such a person, "He shall have everlasting life?" Does he not assert it again when he says, "He *hath* everlasting life?" Does he not assert the same thing when he says, "He shall not *come into condemnation?*" Does he not assert the same thing again when he says, "He has passed from death unto life?" In what sense can a believer who apostatizes from his faith, and perishes forever, be said "to have everlasting life?" Or how is it true of such a one, "he shall not come into condemnation?"

Again, Jesus said to the Jews, "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you, My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." It is evident that by "his sheep," in this passage, Christ meant all true believers; for he said to the Jews, "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep," plainly implying that all who did believe were his sheep. Concerning these, he says, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." It is not seen why the language of Christ in this passage, respecting the salvation of believers, is not as unequivocal, and as strong, as it would be, had he said, in so

many words, All true believers shall eventually be saved.

Another passage, in which the truth under consideration is expressly asserted, is found in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." That every true believer is justified, comparatively few will deny. Indeed, there are none who *can* deny this, without contradicting the apostle, who, in another place, declares, that "all that believe are justified." Now if all who believe are justified, and if all who are justified, will be glorified, according to the passage quoted above, the salvation of all true believers is established upon an immutable foundation.

Many other passages, which assert the fact, that all true believers will be saved, as clearly as those already quoted, might be adduced. But these are sufficient. I shall now, in the *second* place, present before my readers a few passages which do not so expressly assert this truth, but which plainly, and necessarily *imply* it. These are not exhibited, however, with a view of rendering more certain what is expressly asserted by the sacred writers. If the passages above quoted, do assert the fact that all true believers will be saved, the testimony of others is not necessary to render it more certain. But still, there is a propriety in considering other passages; because, if the same truth appears to be supported by them, it will be additional evidence, that we have understood those already considered, according to their true import.

The first passage under this head, to which I would direct the attention of my readers, is that which immediately follows the one last quoted from Paul's Epistle to the Romans. What favours the doctrine of the saints' perseverance and salvation in this passage, is the triumphant joy, which the apostle expresses at the thought, that God is their security against every spiritual foe, and his strong confidence that nothing shall ever separate them from the love of Christ. With the consoling truth, that "all who are justified shall be glorified," full in his mind, he begins with the following language of triumph; "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us *all* things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that has risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?—Nay, in all these things, we are *more than conquerors*, through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Now upon the supposition that Paul believed that all true believers will be saved, this language appears perfectly natural and proper. Conscious himself

of having received the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, and perceiving satisfactory evidence that the members of the Roman church were also true believers, he could, upon the supposition that there was a promise of God that all of this discription should be saved, indulge himself in the joy and triumph which are expressed in this passage. But only suppose that he was not only destitute of evidence that all believers would be saved, but assured that many of them would actually apostatize and perish; and how unnatural and improper his language appears? Upon this supposition, he has reason to fear that both he and others may be led, by the artifice of some spiritual foe, or by the influence of some temptation, eventually to forsake Christ, and, as a just punishment of their sins, be finally excluded from his presence. How then could he, with so much confidence, and joy, exclaim, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" If he knew not but that he and the others associated with him in this language of triumph, should one day fall before his spiritual foes, how could he say, with the same breath by which he particularly enumerates them, "Nay, in all these things, we are *more than conquerors?*" If it is a fact, that saints, however eminent for their piety, have no effectual security against apostacy; how could the apostle, who must have been well acquainted with this fact, honestly make the following profession of security. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord?" This is certainly the language of assurance upon this subject. And nothing but an assurance could justify the apostle, or any one else, in the use of it.

The confidence, which Paul expressed respecting the saints at Philippi, implies the truth which we are attempting to maintain. "Being confident of this very thing, that he, which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." This expression of Paul's confidence, that the work of divine grace, begun in the hearts of the Philippians, would be completed, amounts, if he was divinely inspired, to little less than an *assertion* of the same thing.

The prayers which Christ offered for his disciples, furnish an argument in favour of the perseverance and salvation of all true believers. After having prayed for the Apostles in particular, he says, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us." Here is a prayer for all christians, "that they may become partakers of that divine union, which in heaven, is the most perfect resemblance of the ineffable union of the Father and Son. If then any christian fails of sharing in this union, the prayer of Christ will not be answered." But on a certain occasion, Christ said in a prayer to his Father, "I know that thou always hearest me."

That class of texts which speak of saints as having been "from the beginning chosen unto salvation," proves that they will all

eventually be saved. Paul, addressing himself to the christians at Ephesus, says, "According as he hath chosen us in him, (that is Christ,) before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." Similar to this is his language to the Thessalonians. "God hath from the beginning, chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Now we know that the term *chosen*, or *elect*, is applied in the New Testament, to saints universally. It was to christians, that Christ had reference, when he said, "And shall not God avenge his own *elect?*" Paul was speaking of christians in general, when he asked, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's *elect?*" Peter was writing to christians, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia, when he addressed them by the title, "*Elect*, according to the foreknowledge of God." To the same persons he says, in another place, "Ye are a *chosen generation.*" In the Revelation of John, the angel declares to him, concerning the followers of the Lamb, that they are "*called*, and *chosen*, and *faithful.*" Now if all true believers are among the elect, who, as the Apostle declares, "were from the beginning, chosen unto salvation, through sanctification of the spirit, and belief f the truth," will they not all be saved? To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose that the purpose of God might be frustrated. The certain connexion between the election and final salvation of believers, is most beautifully, as well as strongly expressed, in a passage, which has been before quoted. "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

The following exhortation of Peter to those to whom he addressed his Epistle, plainly implies the salvation of all true believers. "Wherefore, brethren, give all diligence to make your calling and election sure." This passage implies, that there is some means by which saints may become *sure* of the fact that they have been called and elected. It seems to have been the design of the apostle, to exhort them constantly to strive for the attainment of that holiness, which is an indubitable evidence that they are of that number, who were from eternity elected unto salvation, and who have in time been called by an effectual calling. But their calling and election could never be made sure in this sense, if true believers may fall away and perish. Supposing they acquire as much holiness as the most eminent saints ever possess; that their love, and faith, and every grace, are so constant and lively as to give them an assurance that they have been born of God,—they cannot know by this, that they are elected unto salvation; because upon the supposition that true believers may fall away, they cannot but still fear, that their high attainments in holiness are to be succeeded by the lowest depths of sin, and their cheering hope of heavenly happiness, by the actual suffering of infernal pains.

An argument in favour of the saint's perseverance and salvation, may be drawn from an expression, which Christ dropped in his

conversation with the woman of Samaria. In this, he represents the fruits of the Holy Spirit, which he would give to men, under the similitude of the waters of a never failing spring. "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life." Whatever else may be taught by this passage, it certainly assures us of the following truth: From those who have once received the Holy Spirit, in its renewing, and sanctifying influence, it shall never be permanently withdrawn —its parts shall continue through life, (at least at intervals,) be from time to time, a source of satisfaction, with which no worldly enjoyment can bear a comparison; and increase, until they constitute that state of perfect, spiritual life, which shall be forever enjoyed in heaven. Every true christian drinks of the water which Christ has to give. But if he may totally apostatize, what shall prevent his thirsting again? The water, which Christ gives, shall be in the christian, "a well of water, springing up into everlasting life." But if he so apostatizes as eventually to perish, in what sense does the water of Christ, which he has received, "spring up into everlasting life?"

What the apostle John says of the christian hope, confirms the truth, that all true believers will eventually be saved. "Every one that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as *he*," (that is Christ,) "is pure." The idea most naturally conveyed by these words is, that the hope, of which the christian is the subject, and which has originated from the operation of the Holy Spirit upon his heart, is of a purifying nature, and that the ultimate effects of it will be a complete conformity to the moral image of Christ. But upon the supposition, that true believers ever entirely fall away and perish, this is not true. Their hope does not have this effect.

I shall mention but one passage more in proof of the doctrine now under consideration, and that is the declaration of the apostle John. "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Now upon the supposition, that those who are born of God, do entirely fall away and perish; in what sense is it true that they cannot sin? Upon this supposition, they do sin, knowingly, and wilfully, and constantly. Add to this, their sin is "unto death." By the supposition that they apostatize, and actually perish in their sins, it is admitted, that they not only sin in all respects, as other men do, except with aggravated guilt; but that they suffer that eternal death, which is the proper wages of sin. Upon the supposition then, that true believers may fall away and perish, the declaration of the apostle, "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin," appears to be untrue. But upon the contrary supposition, that all true believers persevere in holiness, and obtain salvation, there is a sense in which, "whosoever is born of God, doth *not* commit sin." He does not live a *life* of sin, nor does he commit the unpardonable sin. Although he is frequently guilty of many, and great offences; yet he daily repents, humbles himself before God, and obtains forgiveness. While others are slaves to sin, he is, in a degree, free from its

dominion. While they are pursuing, without interruption, a course of sin, which must inevitably lead to death, and in which they are liable to commit the unpardonable sin; he is habitually walking in the path of life, secured by the promise of God from the commission of that sin which is unto death.

This subject teaches us what opinion we ought to form of those, who appear for a time to be truly pious, but afterwards entirely fall away. We are obliged to conclude they are not what they appeared to be. There were some, in the days of the apostles, who appeared to be the disciples of Christ, and for a time, associated themselves with the apostles, but afterwards renounced christianity, and became its open opposers. Of such, John says, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out from us that it might be made manifest, that they were not all of us." It appears both from the words of Christ, and the writings of the apostles, that persons may be subjects of great light, may be in a sense partakers of the Holy Ghost, may be influenced to make high professions in religion, and to perform, externally, many duties which the gospel requires, and still not be true christians. The following words are from the lips of Christ: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of God; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name have cast out Devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto you, I never knew you, depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Now that the persons here described were never true christians, is evident from the declaration of Christ, "I never *knew* you." As every true christian "knows God," and "is known of God;" as "the Lord *knoweth* them that are his;" if the persons above described, had ever been true believers, Christ can never say in truth, that he never knew them. But it appears that these persons had borne, in many respects, a very near resemblance to true christians; they had often prayed, saying, Lord, Lord;—they had prophesied in the name of the Lord;—they had cast out Devils in his name;—and in his name done many wonderful works. These works they could not have done, had they not been, in some sense, the partakers of the Holy Ghost. They doubtless had had more light, and made greater attainments in the knowledge of divine things, than some true believers. But they were all the while destitute of that "holiness, without which, no man can see the Lord." It is persons of this description, I apprehend, that are spoken of by the apostles, as having "sinned wilfully, after they have received the knowledge of the truth, to whom there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain, fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries:" as having "trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and done despite unto the Spirit of grace, who are justly thought worthy of a much sorer punishment than those

who despised Moses' law, and died without mercy, under two or three witnesses:"—as having "turned from the holy commandment delivered unto them, after they had known the way of righteousness, whose latter end is worse than the beginning." Persons of this description, although they have never received Christ into their hearts, have had such measures of light communicated to their minds by the Holy Ghost, as to know, in a very important sense, his divine power and excellence. So daring is their impiety, and so aggravated their guilt, when they openly renounce christianity, or blaspheme the Holy Ghost, that God has determined, and revealed his purpose, that they shall never be forgiven. Let those who have been well instructed upon the subject of religion, and often felt the awakening and convincing power of the Holy Spirit, beware of their danger.

The subject which has been discussed in this paper, is well suited to administer consolation to all true believers. It gives them just as much evidence that they shall be saved, as they have that they are believers. Those who have good evidence that they do truly believe in the Son of God, may comfort themselves with the expectation, that they shall at last obtain eternal life. If there are any who enjoy an assurance of their *faith*, they may enjoy, and they ought to enjoy, an assurance of their salvation; for Christ himself has said, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Those who entertain a hope that they are united to Christ, cannot indeed be too solicitous to know the nature of their *faith*. There is danger of their being deceived, in regard to *this*, and consequently in regard to their hope of salvation. But if they do receive the Lord Jesus Christ by faith—by that "faith which works by love, and purifies the heart," and have evidence of this, they need not be anxious respecting their future condition. To them who are thus in Christ, there is no condemnation. A.

For the Christian Magazine.

QUESTION.

What is intended by sins of ignorance?

By sins of ignorance, is intended the doing of such things ignorantly, as *in themselves* are wrong. There is a right, and a wrong, in actions *themselves*, separate from the particular intention with which they are performed. Thus, *trespass* is an action wrong in itself; but a person may commit trespass ignorantly, and without any bad intention. B. is employed by A. to fell trees in his forest; but in doing this, he unconciously cuts some very valuable trees in the forest of C. B. is now chargeable with trespass—with doing an action that is wrong in itself; although he did it in perfect ignorance, and without any bad intention. The *taking* of another's property without his consent, and appropriating it to our own use, is a thing wrong in itself; but this may be done ignorantly, and without any bad design. B., who is about embarking for a distant country, puts up for the night at a public house. He lodges in the room with several others, and they all lay their watches on the same table. In the night, B. is summoned to take his departure; and in his hurry, and in a

state of darkness, he unconsciously takes another man's watch, which is worth ten times as much as his own. His mistake is not perceived, till he has actually embarked, and restitution is impossible. B. has now taken the property of another without his consent, and appropriated it to his own use; but he has done it ignorantly, and without any bad design.—These instances, from among the thousands which may occur, and which actually have occurred, may be sufficient to show what, I suppose, is intended by sins of ignorance.

If it be inquired whether these are actually *sins*, and whether the doers of them are *guilty* in the sight of God; I answer in the negative; at least they are not necessarily so. Sin, in the most proper sense of the word—that which incurs guilt in the sight of God, is always committed with a bad intention. But the actions of which we are speaking, are by the supposition, performed ignorantly, and without any bad intention. It is even possible that they may be performed with a perfectly *good* intention. B. may be doing his duty, in the fear of God, and the enjoyment of religion, while he is unconsciously trespassing upon the property of C. For such actions, persons may always render a sufficient excuse. Every one's conscience decides for him, that it ought to satisfy both God and men, if he is able to plead truly, in excuse for a wrong action, *I did it ignorantly*.—I know of no exception to these remarks, unless it be when a person's ignorance is the result of criminal *negligence*, in acquiring light and information; and even then, the criminality applies to the previous *negligence*, and not to the wrong act, which is performed in total ignorance and darkness.

But it will be said, if the actions of which we are speaking, are not properly sins, why are they called sins in the scriptures? And why was it provided in the law of Moses, that an *atonement* should be made for those who had "sinned through ignorance," in order that they might be *forgiven?* These actions are called *sins*, in the scriptures, because they are wrong *in themselves;* and not because they are *criminally* wrong, and *literally incur guilt*. And the atonement which was made for them, may be understood as an *acknowledgment* on the part of those who performed them, that the actions *were* wrong in themselves—such as they did not allow, and such as they never should have performed, had they been favoured with sufficient light. An instituted rite, amounting to such an acknowledgment, was in the highest degree proper, both in a religious and political point of view, in order that the penalty due to the wrong actions might be remitted. Had the persons, performing them, been set at liberty, without such an atonement, or public acknowledgment, the whole church and nation might have been charged with conniving at the evil.

But it will be said again, that on the ground here taken, we shall excuse the Jews in murdering Christ, since it is admitted by Peter, that they "did it *through ignorance;*" and shall excuse Paul also in persecuting the church, for he alleges it as a reason why he obtained mercy, that he "did it *ignorantly*." But it will be sufficient to reply to this objection, that although these Jews, and Paul, were in a state of mind which justifies the expressions

which have been quoted, yet they were not in that state of *total ignorance and darkness*, which is supposed in these remarks. Their ignorance was but partial; and, so far as it extended, it was wholly wilful. It was the criminal result of prejudice and wilful blindness.

On the whole, I think it right to say, that sins of ignorance are actions *wrong in themselves*, which have been committed without a bad intention; and when the ignorance is total, and not wilful, they cannot be morally or criminally wrong. P.

For the Christian Magazine.

REPLY TO XANTHUS.

Messrs. Editors,—In the number of your work for November last, was published a communication of Xanthus, on positive divine efficiency, in Reply to Orange, in your April number. Although I do not approve of the opinion advanced by Xanthus; yet as his communication was written with ability and candour, I think you did right in inserting it. In my apprehension, a little discussion upon this subject, would give an interest to your work, and be useful to your readers. I have waited with impatience to see a reply from Orange; but none has appeared. How to account for this, I know not; but unwilling, that the subject should stand any longer in its present attitude, upon your pages, I send you the following reply.

It was the object of Orange, in his communication, to state and answer some of the most plausible objections to the doctrine of a positive, divine agency, in the evil volitions, and conduct of the wicked. The objections which he he stated and answered, were the three following. 1. "It makes God a sinner." 2. "It infringes the liberty of the agent." 3. "It destroys the use of means." Xanthus admits that Orange has fully answered these objections; but says these are not the objections which are the most commonly made to the doctrine in question; and complains that he should labour to answer those which are seldom, or never made, while he neglects to notice others, which are in the mouths of multitudes, and which he thinks are much more difficult to answer. I am of the opinion, however, that the objections which O. stated and answered, are the objections which are the most frequently urged against the doctrine in question, and am not a little surprised, to hear X. assert, that he "never heard any of them made, except the first, by any who believe in a positive agency, in the case of saints." It is, indeed, true, that no one who believes in a positive divine agency in the case of saints, can consistently make, either of the two last, or the first. But my memory deceives me egregiously, if I have not often heard persons of this description make all these objections. But, be this as it may, it can be shown, I think, that the objections, which X. himself states, may be as satisfactorily answered, as those have been, which were met by O. But before considering these particularly, I have one word to say in regard to X's representation of the agency in question. He says that the agency, which O. attempts to defend, "*is the same in kind and degree that is exerted in the hearts of christians.*" But this is an inference of his own; O. does not assert this. He does, in-

deed, call the agency which he defends, a positive agency. But I cannot find that he informs his readers, whether he means this, or that kind of positive agency; or whether there *is* more than one kind of positive, divine agency or not. Nor does he say a word in regard to *degrees* in divine agency. Of the manner in which God operates upon the minds, either of saints or sinners, O. did not, it is presumed, mean to say a word. He appears to mean only, that God does as *really*, and directly, operate upon the minds of sinners, to produce their sinful volitions, as upon the minds of saints, to produce their holy volitions; without meddling with the question, whether the agency be the same in kind, and degree, or not. I mention these facts, because X. gives the objections which he makes to O.'s view of divine agency, a plausibility which they could not have, if it were not for this unauthorized representation of it. It does not become me to say definitely, what O.'s views on this subject are, any farther than he has expressed them; but this, I need not hesitate to say; I know of no man, who believes in a direct and positive divine agency, in the volition of sinners, who would say, that this is the same in kind and degree, with that which is exerted in the volitions of saints. They do not, indeed, hesitate to say, that the latter, is like the former, in this respect, viz. it is direct and positive. But of the manner, in which God operates in any case, and of the degree of agency employed, and of the different kinds of divine agency, except as they are designated by the effects produced; they are, so far as I know, entirely silent. The different effects produced, lead them to speak of the agency of God, as common, and special. His agency in producing holy exercises, is called *special;* because these are *special effects;* not that it is any more direct, and positive, than that which is concerned in the volitions of wicked men, or in the government of the world in general. The agency of God, in the production of holy exercises, is distinguished from his common agency, in this respect also, it is the appropriate work of the Holy Spirit, in his official capacity. I would not charge X. with any intentional misrepresentation; but justice to the subject which he discusses, as well as to the cause of his opponent, requires me to say, that if he had spoken of positive divine agency, precisely in the light in which it is viewed by its advocates, his objections would have lost at once, more than half their weight. Let X. review his objections, and consider that his opponent admits, as well as he, that the Holy Spirit, in his official capacity, is the efficient cause of none but holy exercises; and that his operations are considered as *special* operations, both on account of their being the appropriate operations of the Holy Spirit, in distinction from the other Divine Persons, and the speciality of the *effects* which they produce; and I cannot but think that the greater part which he has written, in support of his first, and second objections, will appear to him, as they do to me, totally irrelevant to the subject. But I shall not pass over these objections in this general way, but consider them particularly.

1. "The doctrine in question, is contrary to the experience of christians." To this I reply, the agency of God, is nothing of

which experience ever takes any cognizance. Neither saints, nor sinners, are ever conscious of the divine agency upon their minds. They are conscious of their own agency, which is an effect of the divine; but they are no more conscious of the divine agency in their volitions, than they are in the preservation of their lives. And if they are not conscious of the divine agency, it is a clear case, they cannot tell what is true, or false, respecting it, by their experience.

But it is said that christians feel, and frequently say, "that if left to themselves, that is, without any different kind, or degree of divine agency, than they had before conversion, they should have gone on in sin." This is true; they do feel, and say so, and what they say, cannot be contradicted. But what does it prove? Nothing more than what every orthodox man believes: that without the special influence of the Holy Spirit, no person will ever repent and believe, leaving untouched the question, whether the common agency of God upon the minds of sinners, and in the government of the world, is positive or privative, direct or indirect. Christians, I know, are conscious of different affections from those, which they once exercised. But all they know, respecting the kind of divine agency which produced them, is learned from the scriptures, and not from their experience.

2. "This doctrine is inconsistent with the representations of scripture." This objection, I beg leave to answer, by directly contradicting what it affirms. The representations of scripture on this subject, are such as naturally, if not necessarily, to make an impression upon the mind of an attentive, and impartial reader, that God has a direct, and positive agency, in the evil, as well as good actions of men. It is believed, that no person can examine the numerous passages which relate to this subject, without finding it extremely difficult to avoid an impression of this kind. He will be conscious of an impossibility, to escape it, without an effort to set aside their most plain, and obvious import. As a specimen of these passages, let the reader consider the following: "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I *form* the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord, do all these things." "Who *worketh* all things after the counsel of his own will." "For *of him*, and through him, and to him, are all things." "We are not sufficient of ourselves to *think any thing* as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground, without your Father;" (Do not wicked men sometimes kill sparrows?) It is by the exertion of the wicked, that ungodly men are promoted and established in authority. But in this very thing, God claims an agency. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and *giveth* it to whomsoever he will, and *sitteth* up over it the basest of men." There is no truth which every man will more readily admit, than that the kings of the earth are now, and always have been, as a body, prone to do evil. But it is written, "the king's heart is in the hand of the Lord—*he turneth* it withersoever he will." No person, acquainted with the subject, can entertain a doubt of the criminality of those who gave their kingdom to the beast, men-

tioned in the revelation of St. John. But the agency of God, is said to be concerned in this. "For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast." To err from God's ways, and to hearden the heart from his fear, is to sin. But it is evidently implied, in what Isaiah says unto God respecting Israel, that his agency was concerned in their errors, and hardness of heart. "O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear." It is a fact well known, that David sinned in numbering Israel, and that a peculiarly severe, and dreadful judgment fell upon his kingdom, for what he did. But in this sin of David, the positive agency of God appears to have been concerned. "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he *moved* David against them to say, Go number Israel, and Judah." Joseph's brethren have always been considered as criminal, for selling him into Egypt; and when they afterwards stood before him, they acknowledged their guilt. But Joseph acknowledged the agency of *God* in this very thing. "Now, therefore, be not grieved, for *God* did send me before you to preserve life; and *God sent* me before you, to preserve you a posterity in the earth. So now, it was not you that sold me hither, but *God*. As for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." In that hardness of heart which led Pharaoh to defy the God of Israel, and to hold his chosen people in bondage, in opposition to his commands, the agency of God was concerned. "And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and he harkened not unto them, as the Lord had spoken unto Moses. And the heart of Pharaoh and of his servants was *turned* against his people." It is remarkable that the Psalmist ascribes this turning of their heart, to the agency of God. In reference to this very fact, the Psalmist says, "The *Lord turned* their heart to hate his people." Of the Jews, who rejected Christ, it is said by the apostle, referring to a prophecy in the Old Testament respecting them, "*God* hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." Respecting the false prophets, God says, "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet; and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him." Of some who received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, Paul says, "And for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned, who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Now whether the doctrine of a positive, divine agency in the sinful actions of men, be inconsistent with the representations of scripture, I leave to my readers to say. One thing I am sure they will all admit, and that is this; If any preacher of the gospel, speaking of the agency of God upon the minds of the wicked, should now use this language, or any other equally strong, and decisive; he would generally, if not universally, be understood to mean, a direct, and positive agency. Why then should not the scriptures be so understood? The fact that this, and similar language, when used by man, is understood to mean, a di-

rect, and positive divine agency, is proof conclusive, that this is the obvious meaning of the scriptures. Is it not then a little strange, that X. should so confidently affirm, that the doctrine in question, is inconsistent with the representation of the scriptures? It corresponds exactly, not only with the representation given of the subject in the above quotations, but with a list of texts, the length of which forbids their recital. One of the strongest objections, which I feel to the theory advanced by X. in opposition to this doctrine, is, it is inconsistent with the representations of scripture. It sets aside the obvious sense of texts, destroys more than half of their force, and renders them unfit for use on ordinary occasions, without a laborious comment. X. has, indeed, laboured hard to support the above objection to the doctrine in question. But after a long, and patient attention to the facts which he names, I can see nothing which appears to me any more inconsistent with this doctrine, than with his own. He professes to believe in an "efficient, divine agency, which accomplishes all which God designs;" an agency which is concerned in every event in the universe.

It is admitted "that mankind are prone to evil, exclusively and continually." But the question is, why are they so? The fact itself is more satisfactorily accounted for, by admitting, than by denying the doctrine in question. It is admitted that they are often "led captive by Satan at his will." But the question is, why do they *comply* with his temptations? The fact that they do, is as consistent with a direct and positive divine agency, as with a "privative, indirect, and general divine agency," and much more easily accounted for, by the former, than by the latter.

It is admitted "that mankind are not tempted of God when they commit iniquity." But the question is, may not his agency be directly concerned in their voluntarily yielding to, or resisting the temptations which their "own lusts" present? A direct and positive agency in this case, certainly looks no more like a temptation from God, than that "general agency," by which, as X. himself believes, God presents motives before the minds of sinners, which he knows, and designs, shall certainly lead them astray.

It is true, that the good deeds of saints, are ascribed to God in a different sense from that in which evil deeds are ascribed to him. But this is sufficiently accounted for, on the ground that they are *special*, and not common effects of his agency.

X. asserts that the *credit* of good actions is ascribed to God in a peculiar sense, and asks why, upon the principle maintained by O. "are not the actions of the wicked to be ascribed to him in the same sense?" The answer to this is easy; there is no *credit* due to wicked actions, unless it is the good effects which they are overruled to produce, and these *are* always ascribed to God.

X. says, that "the scriptures represent the human mind as a scene of controversy between God, and the adversary of souls," and thinks this representation inconsistent with the doctrine of a direct and positive divine agency upon the minds of the wicked. But I ask in reply, is this representation, allowing it to be just, really any more inconsistent with a direct and postive divine agen-

cy, than with an indirect, but "efficient" divine agency? If X. will only reconcile his own scheme with the representation which he has here given, he will effectually remove the ground of its apparent inconsistency with O.'s.

3. "The doctrine is not in the bible." This, it is believed, is an assertion which very few attentive readers of the bible would venture to make. For myself, I should feel little less hesitation in affirming, that the doctrine of a direct, and positive, divine influence, in the holy actions of saints, is not in the bible. There are as *many* passages of scripture, which speak of the agency of God in the actions of sinners, as there are, which speak of his agency in the actions of saints. The language of the former is as strong, and as expressive of a direct, and positive, divine agency, as that of the latter. And the principles of interpretation, by which the former are made to indicate a "privative, indirect, and general agency" only, must unavoidably render the latter expressive of nothing more. The Arminians have long used these principles of interpretation, to disprove a direct and positive agency in the conversion of sinners.

I agree with X. that it is proper "to ascribe to God in one sense, what is done by man in another sense." But I cannot agree with him in his application of this principle. He certainly makes a very remarkable use of it. After mentioning the difficulty which arises from the fact, that Pharaoh is said to have hardened his own heart; at the same time, it is said, God hardened his heart; he says, "I know of no way to avoid this difficulty, but by adopting the principle in question, and saying God heardened Pharaoh's heart by employing another, (that is Pharaoh himself) to do it." Now in regard to this, I have only to say, the solution of the difficulty is so unnatural and forced, that I can feel no satisfaction at all in it. "God hardened Pharaoh's heart by employing another, (that is Pharaoh himself) to do it!!" This is surely an expedient to get rid of the direct agency of God, worthy of the cause of those who would do it away! But allowing, that God did harden Pharaoh's heart, "by employing another (that is Pharaoh himself) to do it." Is it not quite as natural and quite as easy to suppose, that he influenced him to do it, by a direct and positive agency, as by an "indirect and privative agency?" As we know God did not command Pharaoh to harden his own heart, nor exhort him to do it, nor tempt him to do it, it really seems difficult to affix any definite meaning to the assertion of X. that he *employed* him to do it, unless we suppose that he exerted a positive agency in the case.

Because X. finds that "what is done by man in one sense, is frequently ascribed to God in another sense," he thinks that when God is said to exert an agency in the sinful volitions of men, the meaning is not, that he has any direct influence upon them, but that he merely makes use of secondary causes to lead them to fulfil his purposes. He supposes, that God moved David to number Israel, "by employing Satan to move him." That Satan was used as an instrument or means in this case, is undoubtedly a fact. But to deny the direct and positive agency of God in it, merely because the devil is mentioned as the instrument employed, is precisely the same thing in principle,

as to deny the direct and positive agency of God in the conversion of the Corinthians, because this work was accomplished by the instrumentality of Paul. It is said as expressly that Paul converted the Corinthians, as it is that Satan moved David to number Israel. In his second Epistle to them, we find this declaration, "I have begotten you through the gospel." Now if we are to conclude from the circumstance that this act is attributed to Satan as well as God, that all God did in moving David to number Israel, was to employ Satan to move him;—then we must of course conclude from the fact that the conversion of the Corinthians is attributed to Paul as well as to God, that all God did in this work was to employ Paul and others to present before them the motives of the gospel. But this is a conclusion which X. will not admit. He ought then to give up the premises from which it is legitimately drawn.

Mankind are *dependent* creatures. It is impossible that they should be made in any respect independent. The agency of God must, therefore, always be essential to their agency. "God works in them to will and to do." It is impossible, I apprehend, for any person to understand what the scriptures say respecting the agency of God and his creatures, without admitting the principle that they act in consequence of being acted upon. This principle must be admitted, not only in regard to saints, but to sinners. It serves to explain better than any other the difficult cases presented by X. God inclined Pharaoh in view of the motives presented before him to harden his heart; and this is the reason why *God* is said to have hardened his heart. Pharaoh hardened his own heart in consequence of being thus inclined to do it; and this is the reason why he is said to have hardened his own heart. In the same way, I should answer X.'s question respecting God's moving David to number Israel. Satan was employed to present motives to this sin before David. This is the reason why it is said in one place, that "Satan moved him to number Israel." When the motives were presented before him, the Lord inclined him to comply with the temptation. This is the reason why it is said in another place, the "*Lord* moved David to number Israel." Under the influence of this divine agency and in view of the motive before him, David voluntarily numbered Israel. This is the reason why the transaction is spoken of in another place as David's own act.

INVESTIGATOR.

CONTENTMENT.

HE that hath a competency, hath all the contentment that is to be found in temporary things. Experience will tell him, though riches may increase, yet after a sufficiency is attained, contentment will increase no more, though riches may increase ever so much. *Mede.*

THE most hardened sinner has some conscience left. He knows that all is not quite right, and hence he has occasional fears that all is not quite safe. *Erskine.*

GOD denies a Christian nothing, but with a design to give him something better. *Cecil.*

For the Christian Magazine.

IMPROPER INSTRUCTION TO AN AWAKENED SINNER.

Messrs. Editors,—If you think the following thoughts upon an important subject are worthy of the perusal of your readers, you are at liberty to give them a place in the Christian Magazine.

I have frequently observed the loose, indefinite, and false instruction which is often given to sinners under conviction. For one, I believe that even ministers of the gospel are too apt to give awakened sinners encouragement upon improper grounds, and that laymen are still more prone to this error. There are many, both of ministers and private christians, who, instead of directing them to repent, and to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ immediately, and of spending their whole strength in endeavours to influence them to comply with these conditions of salvation, often converse with them in a manner which leaves a decided impression on their minds, that they are at liberty to wait God's time before they repent, and that they must do something to *get* a new heart, rather than *make* one. They often exhort them to read, and pray, and use other means of becoming converted, when the case imperiously requires that they should be shown their obligation to repent immediately, and the guilt and danger of a moment's delay. I have not only been struck with the difference between this manner of treating awakened sinners, and the manner in which Paul and Peter taught those who inquired of them what they should do to be saved; but alarmed at the consequences of such injudicious treatment. This I verily believe has often been the means of diminishing the sinner's sense of his obligation to repent, and of soothing his fears in regard to the consequences of impenitence. There is reason to believe that it has frequently been the means of keeping sinners from Christ much longer than they would have remained, if they had received scriptural instruction in season. It is not at all incredible that, in many instances, it has been the means of so abating their sense of guilt, and fear of punishment, that they have thrown off their convictions entirely, and returned to their former stupidity. I am led to the indulgence of these apprehensions, not only from the effects which I have frequently *seen* as the result of this mode of treatment, but from what I once myself experienced.

When my attention was first called to the subject of religion, I was very young, and very ignorant, both of my obligation to God, and the depravity of my own heart. For some time my impressions were those of *alarm* merely, arising from a belief that I was destitute of religion, which I had been taught to consider as essential to my future happiness. I soon, however, became convinced of the sinfulness of my heart and life, and felt my obligation to repent and believe the gospel. As this conviction increased upon my mind, I became more and more sensible of my natural unwillingness to turn to God, or to accept the Saviour. I saw that I hated God, and Christ, and the whole plan of salvation. I saw that I did not desire religion from any proper motives, and that all my prayers were but the selfish cries of a distressed but impenitent sinner. My dependence upon myself began to fail—I began to despair of ever doing

any thing to better my condition—I saw myself guilty and helpless in the hands of a sovereign God. In this state of mind I went to a conference meeting, where were a number who had recently obtained a hope of their forgiveness and salvation. They were very joyful and happy, and conversed with each other, and addressed the meeting in a very interesting and solemn manner. At the close of the meeting, on my return home, I fell in company with one of these new converts, who immediately and very affectionately inquired into the state of my mind, which he knew had been for a long time anxious and distressed. I answered, there is no hope for me. He replied, "God offers mercy freely to all." I know that, said I, but I have no heart to receive it, and his offers of mercy will do me no good, if I continue to reject them. "But you must pray for a *new* heart," was his answer. To this I replied, I cannot pray aright. My heart is opposed to God. All my prayers flow from a selfish, impenitent heart, which God abhors. *I don't see as I can do any thing.* "Oh don't be discouraged, he replied; I believe if you pray as well as you can, even if you do not pray with a good heart, God will hear you. Now I advise you to go away alone, and kneel down and pray as well as you can. Keep doing this, and don't give out, and I doubt not you will soon obtain religion." All this, coming from a man, who, as I supposed, had himself just experienced a change of heart, and who, as I knew, was esteemed a man of understanding as well as piety, led me to apprehend that I had given away to needless fears. The confidence which he expressed that I should be heard, if I prayed as well as I could, whether I prayed aright or not, gave me great encouragement. I resolved to make the experiment. Although I remembered to have seen that I was totally sinful, that I had no affections or desires which were not selfish, and that all I had done to make myself better, had only made me worse; yet thought I, I can pray as well as I can, and if that will do, there is hope. This suggestion was peculiarly comforting. I went home greatly relieved: not with the hope that I had been renewed in the spirit of my mind, and that my sins were forgiven, but with a cheering confidence that I had now found out how these blessings might be obtained. I soon found an opportunity to retire, and attempt to pray. In this exercise I still felt conscious that my heart was not right with God. I felt an unusual languor and stupidity—it seemed as though my petitions did not arise above my head. But the thought that if I prayed as well as I could with my present feelings, kept up my courage and determined me to persevere. For several weeks, I followed the direction of my spiritual guide, and comforted myself with the expectation that in this way I should soon experience religion. But at length I found that this confidence in what I should effect by praying as well as I could with an impenitent heart, was gradually abating my anxiety, and rapidly carrying me back to my former state of stupidity. I now saw that I had been all this while, depending upon my own doings, and that I had been led to continue to depend upon them in consequence of what this christian friend had taught, when, as it then appeared to me, I was just

upon the point of giving up all hope from this source. I was now obliged, therefore, to renounce his instruction as false, and to admit the truth of what my experience had taught me before. For several days I felt myself "in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity." I saw that I was under obligation to repent and love God, and at the same time, I saw that the depravity of my heart was such, that I never should submit to him, unless *he* made me willing. This was a time of indescribable distress. I saw myself in the hands of God, and felt an unwillingness to be there. I had no peace. My feelings were now essentially the same as those of which I was the subject before my conversation with the abovementioned friend. It was not long, however, after I lost all hope of doing any thing effectual myself, before I was, as I have reason to believe, set at liberty. And in reflecting upon this interesting scene, I have often thought that this well-meant, although injudicious instruction of my friend, was the means of keeping me longer from Christ, than I should probably have remained, had I never received it. It has appeared to me that I was near the point at which the grace of God finds the sinner and grants him relief, before I was carried back by the influence of this mistaken counsel. And my object in making this communication to the public, is to caution others against giving or receiving "the instruction which causeth to err." If the sinner must be brought to despair of all help in himself, before he can be made to throw himself upon Christ, it is certainly rational, as well as scriptural, to give him that instruction which is the best suited to destroy all confidence in his own unregenerate doings. He should be taught that he is under obligation to be immediately holy, and that this is imperious and indispensable. Let him become thoroughly impressed with this, and he cannot long remain ignorant of his sinful, helpless, and wretched condition. There is nothing like a deep sense of one's own obligation to repent of sin, and to receive the Saviour; to convince him, that unless God give him repentance and draw him to Christ, he is forever undone. Let all, then, who have occasion to preach to sinners, or to converse with them under serious impressions, follow the example of Christ and his apostles, and urge the duty of immediate repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, with all the earnestness of which they are capable. If there is any means well suited to draw them soon to Christ, it is this. If there is any mode of treatment which is likely to prevent their returning to their former state of stupidity, it is this. If there is any mode of treatment which God will condescend to bless as the means of their sanctification, it is this. PENITENS.

PAROCHIAL VISITS.

I HEARD complaints on the subject of a minister not visiting his people. This is a charge which is sometimes well founded, and sometimes not so. The minister of a large congregation would need to have twenty bodies, animated by twenty souls, and to be in twenty places at the same time, and to be cheerful, lively, spiritual, and entertaining in them all, and yet not satisfy the claims of the inconsiderate. When is a minister to prepare for study? How

is he to bring forth things new as well as old, if he does not increase his store? I can recollect that I endeavoured to gratify in this way, but I could not. It was not in my power to be out always, to go every where, or to prolong my visits to a degree that my friends wished. If pastors can satisfy their own consciences, they must disregard unreasonable complaints. *Mem. of Kingsbury.*

From Middleton's Biographia Evangelica.

JOHN ROGERS, THE PROTO-MARTYR UNDER QUEEN MARY.

THIS brave champion for the truth, who had the honour of being PROTO-MARTYR, or the first that was burned for the gospel, in the reign of Queen Mary, was educated at the university of Cambridge, where he attained to a great proficiency in learning. From thence he was chosen by a company of merchants, to be their chaplain at Antwerp; to whom he preached many years. He there happily became acquainted with William Tindale and Miles Coverdale, who fled thither from the persecution of the Papists under King Henry VIII. in England; and, by their means, coming to the true knowledge of Jesus Christ, he joined heartily with them in the laborious, and commendable work of translating the bible into English, and was thereby so much enlightened in the doctrines of the gospel, that he cast off the futile and idolatrous worship of the church of Rome. At Antwerp he married his wife, and from thence went to Wittenburg, daily increasing in knowledge, and became such a proficient in the Dutch language, that he was chosen pastor of a congregation there; which office he discharged with great diligence and faithfulness for some years. In king Edward's time he was sent for home by bishop Ridley, and made prebendary and divinity-lecturer of St. Paul's, where he preached faithfully and zealously till the coming in of Queen Mary. In the beginning of her reign, in a sermon at Paul's cross, he exhorted the people steadfastly and perseveringly to adhere to that doctrine, which they had been taught, and to beware of pestilent popery, idolatry, and superstition. His zeal could not long be unnoticed; and accordingly he was soon called before the privy council, where he answered so scripturally, sensibly, and boldly, and at the same time in so becoming a manner, that, for that time, he was dismissed. But, after the Queen's proclamation against the preaching of the truth came forth, he was again called before the Popish bishops, (who thirsted for his blood,) and committed prisoner to his own house; from whence he might easily have escaped, and to which indeed he had many inducements; viz. his wife and ten children, his many friends in Germany, and the undoubted preferment he would there have met with; but being once called to answer in Christ's cause, he would not depart, though he stayed at the hazard, and, (as will be seen,) to the loss of his life.

After being confined a prisoner in his own house about six months, he was removed to Newgate, and there kept for a long time among thieves and murderers. At length, on the 22d, and several other days of January, in 1555, he was examined before Dr. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and others, in a very illiberal and cruel man-

ner; they not permitting him to speak or answer for himself, nor yet to defend his doctrines in writing: and on the 29th of the same month, Gardiner and others pronounced sentence against him in the following manner: 'In the name of God, Amen. We Stephen, by the permission of God, bishop of Winchester, &c. do find that thou hast taught, holden, and affirmed, and obstinately defended divers errors, heresies, and damnable opinions, contrary to the doctrine and determination of the holy church; as namely these; "That the Catholic church of Rome is the church of Antichrist: *Item*, that in the sacrament of the altar there is not, substantially nor really, the natural body and blood of Christ." We do therefore judge thee and condemn thee, *John Rogers*, otherwise called *Matthews*, (thy demerits and faults being aggravated through thy damnable obstinacy,) as guilty of most detestable heresies, and as an obstinate impenitent sinner, refusing to return to the lap and unity of the HOLY MOTHER CHURCH, and that thou hast been and art by law excommunicate; and do pronounce and declare thee to be an excommunicated person. Also we pronounce and declare thee, being an heretic, to be cast out from the church, and left unto the judgment of the secular power, by this our sentence definitive, which we here lay upon and against thee, with sorrow of heart.'

When this sentence was read, Mr. Rogers again attempted to speak; but was not suffered. He then asked of them to permit his wife, a poor stranger, to see him before he suffered; but this also was denied, and she was absolutely forbidden. When he was taken back to prison, after this and every preceding day's examination, he wrote down the questions put to him, and his answers, as far as they would allow him to speak, and also what he would have said, had he been permitted; which, because of their length, we cannot, consistent with our plan, insert; but must refer those who wish to see them at large, to Fox's martyrology. Yet, on account of their excellency, we presume it will be acceptable to our readers in general to see so much of them as may serve for a specimen of the true wisdom, piety, and zeal of this great and good man.

"But here, (says he,) they will cry out; Lo, these men will be still a John Baptist, an apostle, a prophet, &c.—I answer, We make not ourselves like unto them, in the gifts and power of God bestowed on them to the working of miracles, and the like; but that we are like them in believing the same doctrine, and in suffering persecution and shame for the same. We preach their very doctrine, and none other. This we are able to prove from their writings, which I have proffered to do again and again by writing. And, for this cause, we suffer the like reproach, shame, and rebuke of the world; suffering the same persecution, to the loss of our goods, and even of our lives; and to the forsaking, (as our master Christ commandeth,) father, mother, sister, brethren, wives, children, &c. being assured of a joyful resurrection, and to be crowned in glory with them, according to the infallible promises made unto us in Christ, our only and all-sufficient Mediator, Reconciler, Priest, and Sacrifice: Who, for us as well as them, hath pleased the Father, quieted and pacified his wrath

It takes its constant stand and vigils keeps
Close by the bleak and barren mountain top.
I wonder that it does not flee away
From that unseemly dwelling-place, and join
In happy concert with the train above.

And yet, mild star,
I would not have thee go, for thou dost seem
The semblance of myself. I too, alone,
On the bleak bosom of this barren world,
Light up my wintry fire,—sole counsellor,
Sole partner too of all my joys and cares.
For I have learn'd, from many a bitter proof,
That sin has rendered false the heart of man.
Unstable as the ever changing tide:—selfish
And prone to selfishness; what careth he
For joy of others, or for others' woe?
How little skill'd in ministering relief
To wounded sensibility, the common mass:
How much inclined to violate the trust
In unsuspecting confidence reposed.—
And I have learn'd the end of noisy mirth,
With all the hollow joys the world can give.

Then why forsake
This soothing wisdom-teaching solitude,
And mingle in the throng of joyous men—
Joyous and ruined? Rather let me keep
Conceal'd from mortal sight my joys and woes,
And hold still converse with the Sovereign Lord
Of heaven and earth, and pour into *His* ear
Each rapt emotion, each consuming grief.

Then tarry where thou art, mild star of eve;
Brief is thy dwelling on the mountain top,
And brief my sojourn in this barren world.
A little more, we both shall flee away:
I to the concert of the blessed above—
So hope deceive me not—and thou—with all
The high-sphered family from which thou seem'st
An exile—thou shalt fall no more to rise—
In terror shalt thou fall, and thy bright rays
Shall be extinguish'd in the burning day
That flashes from thy Maker's chariot wheels.

CLIFTON.

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND READERS.

The Poetical effusion of C—Remarks on "The Exclusive System," by an anonymous writer—and P—are received.

In our last number, p. 116, 2d col. 10th l. from bottom, for '*solution*,' read *selection*. Page 117, 1st col. 2d l. from bottom, and 2d col. 4th l. from top, for '*conception*,' read *corruption*.

and runagates. Have we not the like examples now-a-days? O that I had now time to write certain things pertaining to the bishop of Winchester's mercy! I have not time to speak how *merciful* he hath been to me and to my good brethren, and to the duke of Suffolk's most innocent daughter, and her innocent husband. O that I had time to paint it in its proper colours! but there are many who can do it better than I, who shall live when I am dead. Pharaoh had his plagues; and his once most flourishing land utterly destroyed, on account of hypocrisy and counterfeit mercy, which was no other than cruelty and abominable tyranny. And think ye, that the bloody, butcherly, bishop of Winchester, and his bloody brethren, shall escape? Or that England for their offences, and especially for the maintenance of their idolatry, and wilful following of them in it, shall not abide as great brunts? Yes, undoubtedly.

"If God look not mercifully upon England, the seeds of utter destruction are already sown in it by these hypocritical tyrants, and antichristian prelates, papists, and double traitors to their country. And yet they speak of mercy, of blessing, of the catholic church, of unity, of power, and of strengthening the realm. This double dissimulation will appear in the day of the Lord's visitation, when those crown-shorn captains, who have shown no mercy to the poor godly sufferers of this realm, shall have judgment without mercy."*

Mr. Rogers being sentenced to be burned, and remanded back to prison, was on Monday morning, the fourth day of February, 1555, awakened out of a very sound sleep, with great difficulty, by the keeper's wife, who suddenly warned him to make haste and prepare himself for the fire. "If it be so, said he, I need not tie my points." —He was then had down to bishop Bonner, who degraded him; of whom, (he said,) he had one favour to ask. Bonner asked what that should be: "Nothing, answered Mr. Rogers, but that I may speak a few words to my wife before my burning." This request not being ganted; he added, "You declare your charity, what it is." The time being come, he was brought out of Newgate, and delivered up to the sheriffs of London, to be taken to Smithfield; one of whom said, 'Mr. Rogers, will you revoke your abominable doctrine, and your evil opinion of the sacrament of the altar?' Mr. Rogers answered, "That which I have preached, I will seal with my blood." 'Then, (said the sheriff,) thou art an heretic.' "That shall be known, (replied Mr. Rogers,) at the day of judgment." 'Well, (said the sheriff,) I will never pray for thee.' "But I will pray for you," said Mr. Rogers; and so they proceeded towards Smithfield; Mr. Rogers

* In the course of Mr. Rogers' first day's examination, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, asked him;—"What sayest thou? Make us a direct answer, whether thou wilt be one of this Catholic church or not, with us, in the state which we are now?" To which Mr. Rogers answered, "My lord, I cannot believe that ye yourselves do think in your hearts, that he [the Pope,] is supreme head in forgiving of sin, &c. as ye have now said, seeing *you* and *all* the bishops of the realm have now for twenty years long preached, and some of you also written to the contrary; and the parliament hath so long ago condescended unto it." —Here he was interrupted, and not allowed to say any more.

more for some, than for others, it is right for him to do it. If he is pleased to give some a knowledge of salvation, while others are left in pagan darkness; if he saw fit to make the Jews bear the heat and burden of the day, in preparing for the advent of Christ, and then to admit Gentile converts to privileges equal with Jewish converts; and if he is graciously pleased to renew and save some sinners, while he leaves others, equally guilty, to perish in their sins; all this is lawful and right. He does no injustice. All creatures are his. And it is lawful for him to do what he will with his own. No man, nor angel, may say unto him, in reference to any of his works, "what hast thou done?" For

II. No one may *murmur* at what God is pleased to do.

It appears from the parable, that no one of the *first* laborers was allowed to murmur at the householder, because he did more for others, in proportion to their labor, than he did for them. And for this plain reason: he did them no injustice. What he did for others had no actual effect on the justice or injustice of his dealings with them. Indeed, it had no concern with them. They were the mere spectators of it. When he came to reward them, he gave all that justice required: even all that was due, by their own agreement. They had, therefore, no right to murmur, at what was done for others. For no one suffered any injustice.

Now this shows that no one may murmur at what *God* is pleased to do. If *he* does more for some than for others, and more than justice demands; if he gives some the knowledge of salvation, and leaves others in pagan darkness; and even if he *renews* and *pardons* some sinners; while he leaves others, equally guilty, to remain in their sins; no one may *murmur* at these acts of sovereignty. He has done no injustice. All men are sinners; totally vile and unworthy. No one can *claim* a knowledge of salvation, nor the renewing and pardoning grace of God. Though he makes a distinction among men; though he does more for some than for others; and more for some than they deserve; yet he does no wrong. He has good reasons for doing thus; though he may not, at the time, see fit to reveal them. If men *merited* the renewing and saving grace of God; (supposing this were possible;) and if, *then*, he should renew and pardon some and not others; and thus do *injustice* to them that are left, they might reasonably murmur. But, as all are sinners, utterly *unworthy* of such kindness, God may justly do his pleasure, in renewing and saving them. If he pleases, he may renew and save some, and yet leave others in their sins, while no one has any cause to murmur. For

III. It is not an act of injustice, but of *mere goodness*, when God does more for some, than for others.

When the householder did more in proportion, for the last, than for the first laborers, and more than strict justice required; he did the first no injustice. For, as I have already stated, it had no effect on his dealings with them. And therefore it *could* not do them any injustice. Besides, when he rewarded them, he gave them all that justice demanded: yea, all that could be demanded, on the very terms of their own agreement.

But his giving the last *more* than the first, in proportion to

their labor, and more than justice demanded, was an act of *mere goodness* to them. It was in perfect *accordance* with justice; and yet was an act, by which the householder saw fit to display, not only his sovereignty, but his *distinguishing goodness.*

Now, this illustrates, and seems intended to illustrate, both the sovereignty and the goodness of God, in the dispensation of grace. It shows, that when God does more for some sinners, than for others; when he renews and saves some, and yet leaves others, equally guilty, he does no injustice, either to those that are saved, or to those that are lost. What he does for those who are saved, has no effect on the *condition* of those that are lost, nor on the justice of his *dealings* with them. He is no more *obligated* to renew and save them, than he would be, had he not saved others. Their condition is affected, only by what he does for *them.* The justice of his dealings respecting them, depends wholly on what he does for them. But the fact is, if they perish, they perish *in their sins.* The very fact that they *do* perish, under the government of a gracious God; under a dispensation, and amidst the *offers* of grace, is conclusive evidence, that they perish justly. Their future punishment will be no greater, nor be continued any longer, than Divine justice requires. For it is the unalterable declaration of God's word, that he will finally reward all men *according* to their works, whether good or bad.

But his renewing and saving his chosen people, and thus doing more for them than justice demands, is an act of *distinguishing goodness.* It effects an entire change in their characters and destinies. It delivers them from endless wrath, and makes them heirs of endless glory: while all this accords with justice. For surely, it does no injustice to them that are saved; nor to them that are lost; nor yet to the Divine government. The law of God is honored in the very pardon and justification of *all* that are saved. They believe in Christ; they are united to him by faith; and are justified wholly through his atonement. There is, therefore, no injustice whatever, in this display of mercy. It is mere *distinguishing goodness,* in perfect harmony with justice. It is because the great Householder does what he will with his own; and is, therefore, lawful and right. Hence,

IV. To murmur at this goodness of God, betrays evidence of an evil heart.

When the householder had vindicated his own conduct, he asked him who murmured, "Is thine eye *evil,* because I am good?" This was an affirmation of his own goodness; and at the same time, of the *evil* of murmuring. For it was murmuring, not at the *injustice* of the householder toward himself, or toward any other one; (for no injustice had been done;) but at his *goodness,* in doing *more* for others than he had done for him. It therefore betrayed evidence of an evil heart. For it opposed the *exercise* of this goodness, while it harmonized with justice.

Now this exhibits, and was, no doubt, designed to exhibit, the very spirit of those, who murmur at the sovereign grace of God, when he does more for some lost sinners, than he does for others. They murmur, not at his *injustice* to them, but at his doing *more* for others, than he

does for them;—at his making a *distinction* among men, according to his pleasure. But this is murmuring at his distinguishing *goodness;* even at his unmerited *kindness*, in saving whom he pleases, through the atonement of Christ. It is opposing the very exercise of grace, when this harmonizes with justice. In fact, it is opposing the only ground, on which the salvation of sinners *can* harmonize with justice. For, if God did no more for them than they *deserve*, or than justice *demands*, not one of them would ever be renewed; and consequently, not one would ever be saved. It therefore needs no further argument, to prove that *such* murmuring betrays evidence of an evil heart.

Now, with these particulars in view, I proceed directly to illustrate the subject before me; and observe,

First, That the sovereignty of God is *equitable*. Here the object will be, to notice the sovereignty of his *grace:* as this is most liable to objections. And in reference to this, I have already shown, that God has always a right to *do* what he will with his own, and that no one may *murmur* at his doing this. The reason is, he always does what is just and right. If, then, God may always *do* what he will, in reference to the salvation of men, because he always does right, he may also do all this, as a *Sovereign*. It was his just prerogative, to *decree* or *determine* all this, in the counsels of eternity. For, if all his *doings* are right, and if, in the language of inspiration, he "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," his eternal *purposes* or *decrees* are all right. As he is a Being of unerring wisdom and goodness, and the Proprietor of all creation, it was right for *Him* to determine all things, in nature and in grace, according to his good pleasure. For his pleasure was, to determine all things in perfect rectitude. Indeed, being eternal and immutable, he has always been what he now is: he has always had the same wisdom, the same goodness, and even the same purposes, which he now has. So that what he now does, which is always right, is the *necessary* result of an equitable and eternal purpose.

It follows, then, that no one may *murmur* at the sovereign purposes of God, in the affairs of grace; though all these are, like Himself, eternal. The reason still is, they are all *equitable*. They accord perfectly with his doings, which are only the *execution* of these equitable and eternal purposes. Even when he does more for some sinners, than for others, and when all this is the effect of his eternal purposes, no one has any right to murmur. There is no *cause* for it. Both the act itself, and the purpose of action, are according to perfect rectitude. As it is lawful for him, when he pleases, to *do* more for some, than for others, when he does no one any injustice; so it was lawful for him to *determine* all this, in his own best time. Whatever it is right for him now to *do*, it was right for him to *determine*, when he saw best. There is no more cause to murmur at the *purpose*, when this accords with perfect rectitude, than to murmur at the *act*, when this accords with perfect rectitude. And to him, who would murmur at the righteous purposes of God, in the affairs of grace, his answer is, "Who art thou, that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why

hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" Does any one affirm, that this does not appear equitable? His inquiry of such a one is, "Are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal?" And does any one still retain the murmuring spirit of the first laborers? His final answer is, "Be still and know that I am God:—I do thee no wrong:—Is it not *lawful* for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye *evil*, because I am good?"—Thus, the sovereignty of God appears equitable. But this is not all. I now observe,

Secondly, That it is not only equitable, but *desirable*. In every instance of the sovereignty of grace, it has been shown, that there is a display, not of injustice, but of distinguishing *goodness:* a display of mere, unmerited kindness and compassion, in harmony with justice. Every instance of renewing and pardoning mercy, is an instance, in which God does *more* than the sinner deserves: and, consequently, is an instance, in which he *must* be actuated by unmerited kindness. It is thus mere *sovereign* goodness or grace; that is, it is an act, which God performs, merely because he *is* gracious; because he ever has been *determined* to perform it; and thus, in his own language, because he "will be gracious to *whom* he will be gracious." Both the act, and the purpose of action, are the fruit of his free, *sovereign grace*. And if he did not, in every instance, act on this ground, he would not act, in any instance whatever, in saving the sinner. For the sinner cannot *claim* it. Justice to him does not *demand* it. Nothing but the sovereign pleasure of God can be the moving cause of it. And as he is eternal and immutable, if he had not from eternity *decreed* it, he would not, in any case, *do* it.

Hence, notwithstanding all the murmuring and objection of wicked men against it, the sovereignty of God, in the affairs of grace, is truly *desirable*. It is desirable, not only that God should be gracious in his nature and attributes, but that he should be a *Sovereign* in his grace; that he should have formed eternal *purposes* of grace, respecting sinful men. For, he may be gracious in his nature and attributes; a complete atonement for sin may be made; salvation may be freely offered to sinners;—and yet, (were the supposition possible,) had there been no eternal *purposes* of grace, not one sinner would have been actually saved. For, to be saved, they must be *renewed* by the power of God. And as he works all things after the counsel of his own will, if he had not purposed, he would not perform this work; and consequently, no one would be renewed nor saved.

Surely, then, it is desirable that *all* the affairs of grace should be regulated and decided, by the eternal purpose of God. It is desirable, that the *number*, to be saved; that the *method* of their salvation; yea, that the *whole plan and process* of it, from beginning to end, should be matters of his eternal purpose. This would ensure the *greatest* number and the *best* method of salvation. For when, in his holy sovereignty, God determined the number of his chosen people, and the method of their salvation, he did this, as he determined all things, with a view to the full display of his Divine perfections. He looked, not at the merit and claims

of sinners, which had no existence; but at his own glory. He was limited, not by their worthiness, or even their unworthiness; but only by the most perfect display of Divine goodness. In doing *what he would* with his own, or in determining the number of those, who should be renewed and saved, his good pleasure was, to give full scope and operation to his benevolence. He *united* the salvation of his people, with the most perfect display of his glorious attributes. Hence, he chose them all in Christ: he predestinated them to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, *to the praise of the glory of his grace.* Of all possible methods, this was the best for lost sinners. And it must be remembered, that the whole *scheme* of grace, from beginning to end, has immediate relation to *sinners.* It was from a race of *such* beings, that God chose his people, in Christ Jesus: even of those, who, in themselves, were utterly vile and unworthy. And his sovereign *purpose*, originating in his own goodness and grace, included a *far greater* number of such beings, than could otherwise have been included. Indeed, had not the display of grace been the object, and had not mere benevolence and grace determined this number, we know not how even *one* sinner could have been included. We know of no other method, which *could*, consistently with Divine justice, or with the Divine attributes, have ensured the salvation of an individual of our guilty race.——It is, then, desirable, *beyond all expression*, that God should determine and act as a Sovereign, in all the affairs of grace. Yea, it is of unspeakable importance to lost sinners, that he *should* do what he will with his own; and that he *should* have formed eternal purposes of grace, respecting guilty men.

Let him, therefore, who would *murmur* at the sovereign grace of God, take heed to his ways. He murmurs, not at the injustice of God towards himself, nor towards any of his fellow-men, but at his *mere goodness* towards the subjects of his grace. He murmurs, where the first laborers did. His eye is *evil*, because God is good. And if he *perish* in such murmurings, he will perish justly. God never left a humble, *penitent* sinner to perish. He pardons and saves *every* penitent believer. And if the murmurer will repent and believe in Christ, God will pardon and save even *him.* But let him remember, and while he remembers, let him rejoice, that God saves the penitent, because he is a *Sovereign* in the affairs of grace; because he has *determined* to do this, for his own glory; and thus, because he doeth *what he will with his own.* J. A. G.

For the Christian Magazine.

AN EXPOSITION OF 1 CORINTHIANS, II. 14.

"*But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*"

Since the Bible is our only rule of religious faith and practice, and is that, by which we are to be finally judged, it is of the highest imaginable importance, that it should be correctly understood. This remark is, of course, applicable to the passage before us.—It is probable, that few passages of the Bible have been more the

occasion of darkness and distress on the part of some, and of irreverence and presumption on the part of others. It is desirable, that all occasion for such effects should be removed. This can be done only by a correct exposition of the passage in question.

1. Who is 'the natural man?' The apostle opposes 'the natural man,' to the spiritual man. After asserting, that 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God,' he says, in the next verse, 'But he that is spiritual, judgeth all things.' It hence appears, that 'the natural man,' is the opposite of him, that 'is spiritual,' or the spiritual man. Who, then, is the spiritual man, but he, that has been born of the Spirit? 'That which is born of the Spirit, is spirit,' or spiritual. It will not be doubted, that the spiritual man is a subject of the spiritual kingdom of God, and will be finally admitted into heaven. But says an infallible teacher;—'Except a man be born of *the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' The conclusion is obvious, that the spiritual man is the regenerate man;—he, who has been 'born of the Spirit.' As the apostle directly opposes 'the natural man,' to him that is spiritual,' or has been 'born of the Spirit,' it follows, that, by 'the natural man,' he intends man in a state of nature;—*the unregenerate man.*

2. What is to be understood by 'the things of the Spirit of God?' '*The Spirit* of the Lord,' says the Psalmist, '*spake* by me, and his word was in my mouth.' Christ, some time previously to his departure from his disciples, said unto them;—'The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.' Soon after the ascension of Christ, 'Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, Men and brethren, This scripture must needs have been fulfilled, *which the Holy Ghost*, by the mouth of David, *spake* before concerning Judas, which was to guide them, that took Jesus.' In quoting a passage from the Psalms, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews began by saying;—'Wherefore, *as the Holy Ghost saith*, To day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.' Again it is said;—'All scripture is given by inspiration of God. The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake, *as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*' From these passages it is abundantly evident, that the Bible claims to have been given by inspiration of the Spirit of God. Hence, there can be no doubt, that, by 'the things of the Spirit of God,' *the truths of the Bible in general are intended.*

3. What is it truly *to receive* 'the things of the Spirit of God?' In truly receiving them, a speculative belief and acknowledgement of their truth are of course implied. By him, who does not even speculatively believe the scriptures, nor acknowledge their truth, they are not, in any, even the lowest, sense, received. A simple intellectual perception of the meaning of any particular passage of the Bible is not, however, all that is implied in a complete reception of it. Such a perception may be possessed by the avowed infidel. By the aid of an improved intellect and of the true science of interpretation, he may clearly unfold the general meaning of any particular passage, and, at the same time, as-

sert, that the Bible cannot be the word of God, for the very reason, that it inculcates the particular sentiments, which he has proved it to inculcate. Something more than has been stated, must, therefore, be implied in truly receiving 'the things of the Spirit of God.' And that is—*a heart-felt belief of them;—an experimental perception of their truth.* The truth of any particular passage must not only be intellectually perceived, but felt, approved, and loved. There must be a correspondence between the feelings of the percipient and the truth perceived. This view of the subject is, if I mistake not, warranted by the scriptures. The three thousand, who were converted on the day of Pentecost, were 'pricked *in their heart*' by the preaching of Peter, and '*gladly* received his word.' *The heart* of Lydia of Thyatira, was opened by the Lord, that she attended to the things, which, on a certain occasion, were spoken by Paul. This apostle, in writing to the Christians at Rome, said; 'Ye have obeyed from *the heart* that form of doctrine, which was delivered you.' And, in writing to the Christians at Thessalonica, he said; 'Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in *power*, and in the Holy Ghost, and *in much assurance.* And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, *with joy in the Holy Ghost.* When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, *which effectually worketh also in you, that believe.*' And he, moreover, declared to them concerning certain persons, that 'they received not *the love of the truth*, that they might be saved.'

4. How does it appear, that 'the natural man' does not truly receive 'the things of the Spirit of God?' This is asserted in the passage before us. 'The natural man *receiveth not* the things of the Spirit of God; for they are *foolishness* unto him.' It is also either asserted or implied in numerous other passages. 'The preaching of the cross is to them, that perish, *foolishness.* We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews *a stumbling-block*, and unto the Greeks *foolishness.*' No sooner had Christ informed Nicodemus, that, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God, than, in astonishment, the latter exclaimed; 'How can a man be born, when he is old?' Nor did our Saviour's explanation of the nature and necessity of the new birth, at all diminish his astonishment. For, he again exclaimed; 'How can these things be?' So foolish did the preaching of Christ appear to the Jews, that they said unto him; 'Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil. Now we *know*, that thou hast a devil. Whom makest thou thyself?' How foolish did the preaching of Paul appear to the men of Athens. When in that celebrated city, 'certain philosophers of the Epicurians and of the Stoicks encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection. And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears; we would know, therefore, what these things mean. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked; and

others said, we will hear thee again of this matter.' So perfectly unimportant and foolish did the questions at issue between Paul and the Jews appear to Festus, that, in addressing Agrippa on the subject, he said; 'When the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things, as I supposed; but had certain questions against him of *their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive.*' Multitudes, at the present day, regard the doctrines of the cross as uninteresting, inconsistent, absurd; and turn away from them in disgust. But,

5. Why does not 'the natural man' receive 'the things of the Spirit of God?' Why are they 'foolishness unto him?' The answer, in general, is contained in the passage before us. '*Because they are spiritually discerned.*' We have seen, that the natural man, is man in a state of nature, in opposition to man in a state of grace; man unregenerate, in opposition to him, who has been born of the Spirit. Hence, according to the scriptures, he is without holy affections. To feelings of holy love, repentance, faith and joy, he is an entire stranger. These feelings appertain to none in their natural, unregenerate state. The Bible describes them as 'dead in trespasses and sins;'—as possessing 'the carnal mind, which is enmity against God;' as not having the love of God in them; as hating both Christ and his Father; as without 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.' But, with holy affections and desires, no inconsiderable portion of the Bible is intimately conversant. Much, very much, of it is employed in describing the moral beauty of the Divine character, the loveliness of the character of the Saviour, and the feelings of the Christian from the time of his first genuine convictions of sin, through all the variations of his religious experience, to his final admittance into the mansions of the blessed. These are emphatically *spiritual* parts of the Bible; and are fully understood and truly received, only when 'they are spiritually discerned.' In order to enter into the real spirit of them, and truly to receive them, a person must himself have the same kind of feelings, which they are employed to describe. In order truly to receive those passages, which describe the moral glory of God, and the loveliness of the character of Christ, he must himself possess a holy heart, and be under the influence of holy love to God and the Saviour. In order truly to receive those passages, which describe conviction of sin, he must himself have been truly convicted of the same. And in order truly to receive those passages, which describe the repentance, faith, peace, gratitude, submission, joy, and other graces of the Christian, his own heart must be under the influence of the same holy affections. But the heart of the natural man is not under the influence of this class of affections;—it is under the all-controlling influence of a diametrically opposite class of moral affections. And this is the primary, grand reason, why he does not truly receive 'the things of the Spirit of God.' When truly received, 'they are spiritually discerned;' but he, being without holy affections, has no spiritual discernment. There is no sympathy between the spirit with which he is actuated, and that spirit, which breathes from the

pages of the inspired volume. Hence, to suppose that, sustaining his present unholy character, he can so enter into the real nature of 'the things of the Spirit of God,' as to receive them in their spiritual import, is, to suppose something contradictory and absurd. He is, in a spiritual sense, as really blind to the true import of that large portion of the word of God, which is employed in describing holy affections, as is the literally blind man to the meridian splendor of a summer sun. His unholy feelings do no more vibrate in unison with those holy feelings, with which no inconsiderable part of the inspired volume is conversant, than does the soul of the deaf man, with the most exquisite combination of musical harmony.

From the preceding exposition, several important inferences naturally result.

1. The criminality of spiritual blindness. It appears, that spiritual blindness implies the total absence of holy affections, and primarily and essentially consists in moral affections of an opposite character. It is a blindness, which has its seat in the heart. So the point is constantly represented in the scriptures. It is said of many of the Israelites in the time of Moses, that they had not '*an heart to perceive*;' and of the idolatrous among the same people in the time of Isaiah, '*their hearts*' were shut, so that they could not understand; that '*a deceived heart* turned them aside, so that they could not deliver their soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?' St. Paul declares, concerning the Gentiles, that they 'are alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, *because of the blindness of their hearts.*' He says, concerning the Jews, that, 'Even unto this day, when Moses is read, *the vail is upon their heart.*' And, in the following words, which, in his epistle to the Hebrews, he quoted from the Psalms, the ignorance and errors of the same people are said to have their origin and seat in the heart. 'Wherefore, I was grieved with that generation, and said, *They do always err in their heart.*' Is not that, then, which prevents the natural man from receiving the things of the Spirit of God, criminal in its nature? Having its seat in the heart, and consisting in affections the exact opposite of holy love, it can be nothing less, than the essence of sin. Was not the blindness of the Jews of a moral nature? Did it not primarily consist in voluntary exercises of hatred to Christ? And was it not, therefore, criminal? To say, that spiritual blindness is not criminal, is the same, as to say, that it is not criminal to be without holy love to God, without repentance for sin, without cordial faith in the Saviour;—in a word, that it is not criminal to live in constant violation of the first and great commandment of the law, the first and great commandment of the gospel, and without that, in which the essence of all religion consists.

2. The natural man may, with propriety, be commanded truly to receive the things of the Spirit of God. True, it is said; 'Neither *can* he know them; because they are spiritually discerned.' That he is, *in some sense*, unable truly to receive them, is, therefore, evident. And were he, *in the same sense*, unable to receive them, that the literally blind man is to discern the light of day and to behold natural objects, there would be neither reason nor propriety in his being commanded to

receive them. Such, however, is not the fact. His inability to receive the things of the Spirit of God, is not *natural*, but *moral*. It is *voluntary*, *spiritual* blindness; and has been proved to be criminal in its nature. Hence, it is easy to see, that the natural man may, with the utmost reason and propriety, be commanded to possess that spiritual discernment, which is requisite to a true reception of the things of the Spirit of God. He may be commanded to do this with precisely the same propriety, that he is commanded to love God supremely, to repent, to believe the gospel, and thus become a real Christian. Indeed, to require him to make himself a new heart and a new spirit, to break off from his sins by repentance, and to look unto Christ with the eye of affection and of faith, is, one and the same thing, as it is to require him to receive, in their spiritual import, the oracles of God. Accordingly, we hear God, in his word, saying unto the spiritually blind and deaf; 'O ye simple, understand wisdom, and, ye fools, be of an understanding heart. Hear, ye deaf, and look, ye blind, that ye may see.'

3. The nature and the importance of spiritual illumination are obvious. We read, in the scriptures, of spiritual discernment and of spiritual understanding. And, from the view we have taken of spiritual blindness, the nature of these may be conclusively inferred. Spiritual blindness, it appears, primarily consists in unholy affections of heart. Hence, spiritual discernment or understanding must consist in feelings of an opposite nature. Let holy feelings be produced in the soul of the natural man, and he is at once enabled to enter into the true spirit of those passages of the Bible, that are descriptive of the particular class of holy affections, which are in exercise within his bosom. Let the sinner be brought under genuine conviction of sin, and he at once knows what the apostle intended, when he said; 'I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.' Let the love of God be shed abroad in his heart, and he at once knows what the Psalmist meant, when he said; 'Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth, that I desire beside thee.' Let him be bowed down under a sense of indwelling sin, and he knows what an apostle meant, when he said; 'O wretched man, that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' Let him be under the influence of disinterested benevolence toward mankind, and of ardent desires for their salvation, and he knows what the same apostle intended, when he said;—'I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart. For I could wish, that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' Let him be under the influence of strong faith and holy joy in the Saviour, and he knows what another apostle meant, when he said; 'Whom, having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' The same mode of remark might, were it necessary, be extended to each distinct class of the christian affections. Whatever may be the particular class of holy affections in exercise at any given time, in the heart of the Christian, the

texts of scripture, that are descriptive of them, are spiritually discerned. Such is spiritual illumination. And its *importance*, as well as its nature, may be inferred from the nature of spiritual blindness. Spiritual blindness is an effectual obstacle in the way of a true reception of the things of the Spirit of God. There is no sympathy between the feelings of him, who is under its influence, and those holy feelings, of which a large portion of the word of God is descriptive. It as effectually prevents him, who is under its influence, from entering into the true spirit of a very considerable portion of the Bible, as literal blindness prevents the subject of it from perceiving external objects. But let it be removed by the Spirit of God, and a new moral world immediately opens on his spiritual vision. The Bible has not, indeed, changed. It is, in reality, the very same book, that it was before. But a radical moral change has been wrought in him, and, by means of it, those things of the Spirit of God, which before were foolishness unto him, are spiritually discerned, and clothed with ineffable beauty. Spiritual illumination is, therefore, just as important, as is an experimental understanding of the word of God.

4. The prevalence of error on religious subjects, is naturally to be expected. Since natural men are blind to the true spiritual import of no inconsiderable portion of the Bible, what is naturally to be looked for as one result, but that the religious creed of many of them will be full of error? True it is, that, so far as the mere *language* of any particular portion of the word of God is concerned, they may be able, by the aid of a well-disciplined mind and the true principles of exegesis, to give a correct exposition of it. This, however, is not always, nor even generally, to be expected. Between their unholy feelings and those holy feelings, of which much of the Bible is descriptive, there is a mutual repulsion. Hence, it is naturally to be expected, that they will endeavour so to interpret the Bible, as to render it congenial with the predominant affections of their unsanctified hearts. It is to be considered, that 'the feelings of the natural heart exert a pernicious influence on the understanding.' Natural men have '*their understandings darkened*, through the ignorance, that is in them, *because of the blindness of their heart.*' Though the natural strength of the human understanding is not impaired in consequence of the apostacy, yet, the blindness of the natural heart has a strong tendency to modify its exercise;—to alter the range of vision of this eye of the mind, and to interpose a mist between it and its object. We know, that, in all cases, our feelings have no small influence in the formation and adoption of our speculative opinions. 'The heart governs the understanding.' In view, then, of the spiritual blindness of the natural heart, and the obvious tendency of this blindness to bias the understanding in its interpretations of the Bible, how naturally may prevalence of error on religious subjects be expected.

5. We infer, that a holy heart is requisite for the teacher of religion. Since spiritual blindness naturally exerts a pernicious influence on the understanding in its investigations of divine truth, the teacher of religion, who is under its influence, must ever be in danger of embracing error himself, and, of course, of teach-

ing it to others. But grant, that he may be led to a correct speculative belief of the truths of the Bible, and we shall not deny that this is possible, he will not inculcate them with that zeal, and earnestness, and glow of religious affection, with which it is unspeakably important, that 'the glorious gospel of the blessed God' should ever be preached. Its truths will not fall from his lips with that weight on the consciences of his hearers, with which the same truths fell from the lips of a Paul, a Baxter, a Whitefield. As they will not go from his heart, they will not reach and affect the heart of his hearers. Therefore, his preaching will not be likely to be blessed to the accomplishment of the end, for which the ministry of the gospel was instituted. How indispensably necessary, then, is a holy heart, and consequent spiritual discernment, for the teacher of religion. Awful is the condition of that professed minister of the gospel, who is without this primary qualification for the ministerial office! Lamentable beyond expression is the condition of that people, over whom he is placed as their spiritual guide! 'If the blind lead the blind,' what can be expected, but that both he, who leads, and they, who are led, will fall into the bottomless pit?

Finally: Permit me to bring home the question to the conscience and heart of the reader;—Do you truly receive the things of the Spirit of God? If you have evidence, that you do truly receive them; that there is, in fact, a sympathy at times between your feelings and those holy feelings, of which much of the inspired volume is descriptive, how unspeakably great are your obligations of gratitude to the God of all grace, that, in sovereign mercy, he was pleased to open your eyes, and turn you from darkness to light. But if, on the other hand, you are conscious, that you do not truly receive the things of the Spirit of God, be assured, that, for being thus the subject of spiritual blindness, you are criminal and inexcusable. So you are regarded by your God and Judge. How dangerous is your situation! The blindness of your heart, though voluntary and criminal, is, notwithstanding, so unyielding to natural means, that it will be effectually removed by nothing short of the almighty energy of the Spirit of God. And he is under no obligation to grant you the blessing. Under such circumstances, how important for you penitently to say unto him; 'God, be merciful to me a sinner.' 'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.'

F.

For the Christian Magazine.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTOLICAL WRITINGS.

An attempt has been made, of late, to depreciate the writings of the Apostles. They are represented as unworthy of a comparison with the declarations of our Lord, in point of scriptural authority. "The teaching of *Jesus*," it is said, "must be regarded as the fountain of Christian truth. The instructions of others are but streams flowing from it, some nearer the source, and some more distant; but *all likely to be more or less affected by the character of the channel which conveys them, and the soil through which they pass.* The Spirit preserved the apostles from *injurious* errors, in communicating and recording truth; but

still, *they are not to be put on a level with their infallible Master.*"*

The best mode, perhaps, of vindicating the authority of the apostolical writings, is to show, not only that they taught with all authority from Christ, but that they were charged with inculcating truths, which could not so well have been exhibited, during his personal ministry. It was left for them to complete the revelation which had been so long in progress; and fill up the canon of the book of God. *Their Divine Master did not himself reveal to them the truth so fully, as he intended it should afterwards be revealed to them, and through them to the world, by the teaching and inspiration of the Holy Spirit.* This is proved,

1. By the *declarations of Christ himself.* In his last conversation with his disciples, previously to his being betrayed, he said, "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things*, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." And again; "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, *he will guide you into all truth.*" These declarations are explicit, and are sufficient, of themselves, to establish the proposition under consideration. As this, however, is a point of very great importance, it may be proper to confirm it by other proofs. Let it then be observed,

2. That the grand object for which Christ appeared in our flesh and world was, *not to impart religious instruction*, but *to make an atonement for sin*, by his sufferings and death upon the cross. It is admitted, indeed, that he executed the office of a *prophet*, as well as of a priest, and of a king; and that in the execution of his prophetical office, he communicated much most interesting and valuable instruction. Still it is believed that the grand, *leading* object, for which he appeared on earth, was not to teach, but to *atone* for the sins of men. The other objects of his mission he might have accomplished, without appearing bodily on earth. He might have *instructed* mankind by inspired prophets and teachers, as he had done all along previously to his advent, and as he afterwards did by the ministry of his apostles. And he might have *ruled* his spiritual kingdom by an invisible agency, as he now rules it in his heavenly state. But in order to suffer and die on the cross, and thus make an atonement for sin; he must necessarily assume our flesh, and appear in our world, and become a man. There was no other possible way, in which this painful part of his Mediatorial work could be accomplished. Accordingly, he himself represented, that the grand object, for which he had come into the world, was *to die.* "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and *to give his life a ransom for many.*" But if this was the grand object for which Christ came, then it needs not surprize us if he did not communicate all that truth to his disciples, during his personal ministry with them, which he intended subsequently to impart. He could instruct them just as well, and in some respects better, through the teaching of the Spirit, after his ascent to heaven.

* See "Discourses on the offices and character of Jesus Christ," by Henry Ware, Jun. p. 14.

3. In proof of the point before us, let it be considered farther, that the personal instructions of our Lord were not accompanied very much with the *sealing, sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost.* In imparting his instructions, our Saviour was no more than a dispenser of means. He dispensed them, to be sure, in the most desirable way. Whatever he said was, in itself, most suitable to be said; and was said in the best time, and place, and manner. Still, his instructions were no more than means, and, like other means, had no inherent efficacy. They needed the accompanying influence of the Spirit, to render them effectual to the edification of saints, or to the conviction and conversion of sinners. But this necessary influence was, for wise purposes, restrained; so that it seemed, often, as though Christ communicated his instructions almost in vain. Sinners were not in any considerable numbers converted, and his friends were not enlightened and profited, as we might reasonably expect. We are often astonished at the remaining ignorance and prejudices of the disciples, notwithstanding all they had seen and heard, during the ministry of their Divine Lord. The reason why they were not more enlightened is, that *spiritual influences were withheld;* and these being withheld, it was impossible for the Saviour to reveal the truth so fully to them, as it was afterwards revealed through the ministry of the Spirit. They needed the Comforter from heaven, not only to "guide them into all truth," but to "bring all things to their *remembrance*," which their Lord had taught them. Again,

4. That Christ did not reveal the truth so fully to his disciples, as he intended it should afterwards be made known to them by the Spirit, is evident, I think, from *facts.* It is a fact, that they did understand many things, after the descent of the Holy Spirit, which they never understood before; and some, which before were not very clearly revealed. One of these was, the *spiritual nature* of their Master's kingdom. During the whole course of his ministry, they were expecting him to set up a temporal kingdom, and to advance them to seats of temporal honor and power. But when the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost, *he* soon discovered to them the truth, in regard to this important subject. He soon taught them, that they were not to expect any flattering temporal distinctions—that the kingdom of Christ was not of this world—and that it devolved on them, in face of persecution and conflict, to diffuse his holy, *spiritual* kingdom, throughout the earth.—Till after the descent of the Holy Spirit, the disciples seem not to have comprehended the *necessity*, or the *object*, of their Saviour's death. When he spake to them on the subject of his approaching crucifixion, it is related, that they "knew not what he said." On one occasion, when he introduced this subject, Peter took him aside, and began to rebuke him. And when they saw their Saviour actually dead upon the cross, their hopes, for the time, seemed to die with him. "We trusted," said they, "that this was he who should deliver Israel;" but he is dead—and we are left in sorrow and despair. But after the descent of the Holy Spirit, they were soon brought to a proper understanding of this most important subject. They soon learned, that "it *behoved*

Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead, that so repentance and remission of sins might be preached in his name, among all nations." They soon learned, that the same event, which they once regarded as fatal to their Master's cause, was itself the corner-stone of his kingdom. The apostles were not made to understand, during the personal ministry of Christ, that the blessings of the gospel were to be *extended to the Gentiles*. Their Master had said to them, on one occasion, "Go not into the way of the *Gentiles*, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." And although he directed them, at the last, to "preach the gospel to every creature;" yet they were led, for a time, to confine their ministry to the Jews. But after the descent of the Holy Spirit, their views on this subject were enlarged and corrected; the middle wall of partition was shown to be broken down; and the wondering disciples exclaimed with joy, "Then hath God also to the *Gentiles* granted repentance unto life." Another thing, which the disciples did not understand, and which indeed was not clearly revealed, till after the descent of the Holy Spirit, was the true *import and meaning of the Jewish ritual*. The Jews, in general, and the disciples of our Lord among the rest, regarded the bloody sacrifices of the ritual, as having some inherent efficacy. They trusted in them to make an atonement, and to secure the pardon of their sins. They supposed, doubtless, that these rites and sacrifices would be *permanent*—that, as God had appointed them, they would continue, till the end of time. But when the Spirit had come, and his enlightening influence had begun to chase away the darkness of their minds, they were led to see, and to teach, that the rites of the Jewish religion were but a shadow of good things to come—that they all looked forward to the sacrifice of Christ—and that by his death, he had taken them out of the way, nailing them to his cross. Thro' the teaching and inspiration of the Divine Spirit, the apostles were enabled to furnish a key, by which the riches of the Jewish ritual are unlocked, and by which Gentile believers, in all ages, have been instructed and benefited. From the instances here given, we see it to be matter of fact, that our Lord did not disclose the truth so fully to his disciples, or impress it so deeply upon them, as he intended it should afterwards be done, by the ministry of the Spirit. He taught them such things as they were then capable of receiving—such as the circumstances of time and place required, in the best and plainest manner,; but he left it for the Spirit to shed around them a clearer light, and to perfect the work in which he had been engaged. "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, *he shall guide you into all truth*. The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things*, and *bring all things to your remembrance*, whatsoever I have said unto you."

It will be seen that the proposition, which has been discussed and established, places the *inspiration of the apostles, and the authority of their epistles and other writings, on high ground*. No part of the inspired volume, not even the declarations of our Lord him-

self, can be regarded as having superior claims. Christ did not pretend to teach the gospel fully, during his personal ministry on earth. He left many truths to be opened to his disciples, by the influence of the promised Spirit. The writings of the apostles should be considered, therefore, as the very *witness* of the Spirit. They should be considered as the *filling up* of the record from on high—as the last *finishing stroke* of heaven, to the revelation which has been given to man. No part of the Bible possesses higher authority. No part is more worthy to be believed, studied, and reduced to practice. No part is more "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

The difficulty with those, who are endeavoring to depreciate the apostolical writings, is, not a want of evidence in support of the scriptural authority of these writings, but a want of *complacence* in the sentiments which they inculcate. Persons dislike the religious sentiments of the apostles, especially those of Paul; and in order to discredit these obnoxious sentiments, the writings of Paul must be undervalued and discredited. But let such persons beware how they indulge themselves in this way. They can alter nothing. The unbelief of men cannot render the truth of God of no effect. They may undervalue, and mutilate, and reject as many passages and portions of the inspired volume as they please; but when they have done their utmost, the obnoxious portions will all remain. They will remain just as they were before. Whenever they look into their Bibles, these will stare them in the face; while conscience will whisper the fearful denunciation, "If any man shall take away from the words of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." P.

For the Christian Magazine.

THOUGHTS ON PRAYER.

It is the opinion of many eminent divines, that prayer consists in offering up proper desires to God for things agreeable to his will. If we admit this to be a true definition of prayer, we must admit that mere desires or immanent affections, which are not *verbally* offered up to God, are no prayer. Men may think about temporal or spiritual objects, and exercise desires, and hopes, and fears about them, without clothing their thoughts, or hopes, or fears, or desires, in language; and in all such cases, they may be said to study, to muse, or to meditate; but they cannot be said to *pray*, which is *verbally* offering up proper desires to God for things agreeable to his will. But some suppose that men may pray as really and sincerely *without*, as *with words*. This is the opinion of may sober Deists. They acknowledge the existence of God, and their dependence upon him for life, and breath, and all things, and their obligation to be thankful and submissive. But they deny the duty and propriety of verbal prayer, and justify themselves in the total neglect of offering their desires to God in words. This was the opinion of Dr. Franklin, after as well as before he renounced Deism and professed to embrace Christianity. He acknowledges he was a Deist in the early part of his life, but afterwards he acknowledged the truth of the christian religion. Still he denies the propriety of verbal prayer,

and expressly calls it a mere *flattery* and *mockery* of the Deity. And there is reason to fear, that many who profess to believe the truth and divinity of the Bible, entertain a similar opinion in respect to prayer, and fondly imagine that they can pray internally and sincerely, while they cast off fear and restrain verbal prayer before God. It ought to be understood, that meditation and prayer are different duties, and that the former cannot be a substitute for the latter. How many are more willing to meditate, than to pray? and how many do often meditate, that never pray? But some, who wish to be excused from *verbal* prayer, may still ask, 'Cannot men make what are called *ejaculatory* prayers, without using words?' It is evident *they cannot.* There is as essential a difference between meditation and ejaculatory prayer, as between meditation and audible prayer. This may be illustrated by a single instance. When Nehemiah was admitted into the presence of the king of Babylon, to make his request to go to Jerusalem, he says, "Then the king said unto me, For what dost thou make request? *So I prayed to the God of heaven.* And I said unto the king, If it please the king, and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight that thou wouldest send me unto Judah, unto the city of my father's sepulchres, that I may build it." The prayer which Nehemiah made on this important occasion, he made in the *presence* of the king, and therefore it was an ejaculatory prayer, *verbally*, though not *audibly*, offered up to God. He not only had such thoughts and desires in heart, but *expressed them to God.* Had he not expressed his thoughts and desires in words, they would not have been any prayer at all. Men cannot pray by mere meditation. Prayer is calling upon God, and not merely *thinking of him.* No men are afraid to think, and even to think of God; but many are afraid to clothe their thoughts in language, and in that way offer them up to God. DANIEL.

For the Christian Magazine.

POLYGAMY.

MILTON, in his lately discovered "Treatise on the Christian Doctrine," advocates, among other wild and erroneous opinions, the lawfulness of Polygamy. In an elaborate Review of this Treatise, in a late number of the "Christian Examiner," attributed to Rev. Dr. Channing, of Boston, we have the following remarkable expressions relative to the subject. "No part of his (Milton's) book has given such offence, as his doctrine of the lawfulness of Polygamy; and yet no where is he *less liable to reproach.* It is plain that *his error was founded on his reverence for Scripture.* He saw that polygamy was allowed to the best men in the Old Testament; to patriarchs before the law, who, he says, were the objects of God's special favor; and to eminent individuals in subsequent ages; and finding *no prohibition of it in the New Testament*, he believed, that not only holy men would be traduced, but scripture dishonored, by pronouncing it morally evil. We are aware that some will say, that the practice *is* condemned in the New Testament; and we grant it *is* censured, by implication, in these words of Christ, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.'

But we believe it to be an *indisputable fact*, that although christianity was first preached in Asia, which had been from the earliest ages the seat of polygamy, *the apostles never denounced it as a crime, and never required their converts to put away all wives but one.*"

With how much reason this reviewer attributes the error of Milton to "his *reverence for scripture*," and asserts that there is no prohibition or censure of polygamy in the New Testament, will appear from the following declarations of Christ and his apostles. Eph. v. 31, "A man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his *wife* (not *wives*) and they *two* (not *half a dozen*) shall be one flesh." Mark, x. 11, 12, "Whosoever shall put away his *wife* (not *wives*) and shall *marry another*, committeth adultery against her; and if a woman shall put away her *husband*, and be *married to another*, she committeth adultery." Rom. vii. 2, 3, "The woman, which hath an husband, is *bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth*; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if, *while her husband liveth, she be married to another man*, she shall be called an adultress;" and, by parity of reasoning, if, *while the wife liveth, the husband shall be married to another woman, he shall be called an adulterer.* 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12, "A bishop," who is required to be an *example* unto his flock, "must be blameless, the husband of *one wife*. Let the deacons be the husband of *one wife*." 1 Cor. vii. 2, "Let every man have his *own wife* (not *wives*) and let every woman have her *own husband*."

These declarations of our Lord, and of his inspired apostles, need no comment. If they do not settle the question of polygamy, no language which they could have used would be sufficient to settle it.

It ought in justice to be added, relative to the reviewer spoken of in this article, that he is not himself the advocate of polygamy; but it is too evident, from what he has written, that he is either deplorably ignorant of the New Testament, or deplorably deficient in respect for its holy precepts. W.

For the Christian Magazine.

"THE EXCLUSIVE SYSTEM."

ORTHODOX Ministers and Christians are censured by Unitarians, for practising upon what they call "the *exclusive system.*" But let us look at this subject a little. Who, I ask, are those, whom Unitarians are accustomed exclusively to applaud? Those of their *own sentiments.* Whose sermons and works do they review and extol, as worthy of all commendation and praise? Exclusively those of *Unitarians.* To whom do they accredit nearly all the talents, and learning, and charity, and piety, in the country? To *Unitarians.* And whom do they appoint to every office of trust and profit, within their reach or gift? *Unitarians.* Who, then, I ask but once more—who are chargeable with practising upon "the exclusive system?" UNITARIANS.

For the Christian Magazine.

A COMMENT.

Messrs. Editors.—In the course of my reading I have somewhere met with the following comment,

which I send you for publication, if you shall think it proper to insert it in your work.

Heb. xi. 35. "Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a *better* resurrection."

"When the whole verse is literally translated from the Greek, the English reader will immediately discover *it*," (the meaning of a better resurrection.) "The whole verse, then, is this: women, the widow of Sarepta and the Shunamite, received their dead *by a resurrection:* and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain *a better resurrection;* i. e. a resurrection better than that before mentioned. For the children whom the aforesaid women received by a resurrection, were by the prophet restored to live a dying life in this world. But the martyrs here spoken of, looked for a resurrection to an eternal life in another state, which is better than a resurrection to live in this world."

FILIAL DUTIES.

As the duty of obedience flows from the necessary power of the parent, in relation to the ignorance and weakness of those who are new to life, and therefore need his guidance, the filial duties of another class flow from the benefits conferred by the parent—benefits greater than can be conferred by another; since to them is due the very capacity of profiting by the benefits of others. Of how many cares must every human being have been the subject, before he could acquire even the thoughtless vigor of boyhood; and how many cares additional were necessary, then to render that thoughtless vigor something more than the mere power of doing injury to itself! They whose constant attendance was thus necessary to preserve our very being—to whom we owe the instruction we have received, and in a great measure, too, our very virtue, may have sometimes, perhaps, exercised a rigour that was unnecessary; or abstained from affording us comforts which we might have enjoyed without any loss of virtue. But still the amount of advantage is not to be forgotten on account of some slight evil. We owe them much, though we might have owed them more; and owing them much, we cannot morally abstain from paying them the duties of those who owe much. They should have no wants, while we have even the humblest superfluity;—or rather, while want is opposed to want, ours is not that of which we should be the first to think. In their bodily infirmities we are the attendants who should be most assiduous round their couch or their chair; and even those mental infirmities of age which are more disgusting—the occasional peevishness which reproaches for failures of duty which were not intended—the caprice that exacts one day what it would not permit the day before, and, what it is again to refuse on the succeeding day;—we are to bear, not as if it were an effort to bear them and a sacrifice to duty; but with that tenderness of affection which bears much, because it loves much; and does not feel the sacrifices which it occasionally makes, because it feels only the love which delights in making them. Lovely as virtue is in all its forms, there is no form in which it is more lovely than in this ten-

der ministry of offices of kindness —when the kindness, perhaps, is scarcely felt or considered less as kindness than as the duty which might have been fairly commanded, and which there is no merit, therefore, in having paid. Though we have often the gratification of seeing in the progress of life, many beautiful examples of age that is not more venerable for its past virtues than amiable with a lasting and still increasing gentleness, which softens the veneration, indeed, but augments it even while it softens it,—it is not always that the last years of life present to us this delightful aspect; and when the temper is, in these last years unfortunately clouded,—when there is no smile of kindness in the faded eye, that grows bright again for moments only when there is fretfulness in the heart,—when the voice that is feeble, only in the utterance of grateful regard, is sometimes loud with tones of a very different expression—the kindness which, in its unremitting attention, never shows by a word or look, the sadness that is felt on these undeserved reproaches, and that regards them only as proofs of a weakness that requires still more to be comforted,—is a kindness which virtue alone can inspire and animate, but which in the bosom that is capable of it, virtue must already have well rewarded. How delightful is the spectacle, when, amid all the temptations of youth and beauty, we witness some gentle heart that gives to the couch of the feeble, and, perhaps, of the thankless and repining, those hours which others find too short for the successive gaities with which an evening can be filled; and that prefers to the smile of universal admiration, the single smile of enjoyment, which after many vain efforts, has at last been kindled on one solitary cheek! If filial love be thus ready to bear with bodily and moral infirmities, it is not less ready to bear with intellectual weakness. There is often, especially in the middle classes of life, as great a difference of mental culture in the parent and the child, as if they had lived at the distance of many centuries. The wealth that has been acquired by patient industry, or some fortunate adventure, may be employed in diffusing all the refinement of science and literature to the children of those to whom the very words, science and literature, are words of which they would scarcely be able, even with the help of a dictionary to understand the meaning. In a rank of life still lower, there are not wanting many meritorious individuals, who, uninstructed themselves, labour indefatigably to obtain the means of liberal instruction for one, whose wisdom, in after years, when he is to astonish the village, may gratify at once their ambition and love. It would indeed be painful to think, that any one whose superiority of knowledge has cost his parents so much fatigue, and so many privations of comforts, which, but for the expense of the means of his acquired superiority, they might have enjoyed, should turn against them, in his own mind, the acquirements which were to them of so costly purchase,—despising them for the very ignorance which gave greater merit to their sacrifice, and proud of a wisdom far less noble, when it can thus feel contempt, than the humble ignorance which it despises.

He who in the fulfilment of every filial duty has obeyed as a son should obey, and loved as a son should love, may not, indeed

with all his obedience and affection, have been able to return an amount of benefit equal to that which he has received; but in being thus virtuous, he has at least made the return that is most grateful to a virtuous parent's heart. He has not been unsuccessful in that contest of mutual love in which it is happy to conquer and happy to be overcome.

Brenn's Lectures.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER VIII.

* * * * Then I saw in my dream, that the Pilgrims, *Thoughtful* and *Ardent*, ascended the hill *Difficulty;* and after refreshing themselves a few moments at the arbor, where the Pilgrim *Christian* had formerly rested, they proceeded towards the top of the hill, intended to lodge that night at the house *Beautiful*, that they might enjoy the conversation of the venerable matrons, *Piety*, *Prudence*, and *Charity*, who dwell there.

But the hill was so steep, and the path so difficult, that they were now greatly fatigued, and longing for a place of rest, when they espied before them a large mansion, at a little distance from the way on the left hand, built with great magnificence, on which they perceived, as they drew nearer, inscribed in large letters, *The House Beautiful, for the entertainment of Pilgrims.* So they approached, and a man came out to meet them, with the name *Watchful* inscribed on his forehead, and invited them to enter. Upon which *Thoughtful* asked,

Is this the same house Beautiful, at which the Pilgrim Christian was entertained?

No, said the man. That house had become antiquated, and very much gone to decay; and my mistresses have caused this new one to be built, as you see, in the modern style.

We saw no lions by the way side, said Thoughtful.

No; said the man. My mistresses discovered that they frightened many Pilgrims of very hopeful dispositions, and deterred them from coming to our house; and being desirous to entertain as many as possible, they caused the lions to be removed.

But I understood, said Thoughtful, "that they were placed there for the trial of faith where it is, and for the discovery of those that have none;" and that they never hurt any who kept in the middle of the path.

At this the porter smiled, and said, I perceive that you are not yet acquainted with the numerous improvements of modern times. But, come in. My mistresses are anxious to receive all that are willing to come.

Then said Ardent to his companion, let us accept the invitation which is so kindly offered us. I see no reason why we should hesitate. If this is not the same house at which Christian lodged, I doubt not we shall find entertainment equally good.

So saying, he took his companion by the arm, and they entered the porch.

But here Thoughtful made a pause, and began to tell of what parentage they came, and how they had entered the way at the *wicket* gate, and had been at the *Interpreter's* house, and understood and approved the statutes of the Lord of the way; and such things as he knew Pilgrims

had been formerly inquired of, when they were received at the house Beautiful, upon which the porter said,

Such inquiries are no longer deemed of any importance. It is sufficient in order to be received here, that you are desirous of going to the celestial city. It is immaterial to us, whether you came through the wicket gate, or climbed up some other way. We deem it of no consequence whether you understand or approve of the laws and rules which were formerly so highly valued. The instructions of the Interpreter are of little use, in this enlightened age. If you call yourselves Pilgrims, and profess to love the Lord of the way, we take it for granted that you are sincere, without inquiring what views you entertain respecting him. "The affections of the heart are all that my mistresses regard." If these are sufficiently ardent they never inquire of what nature they are, or from what principles they proceed. Such inquiries would only serve to perplex and embarrass our guests, and rather do harm than good.

And now I perceived that the mistresses of the mansion themselves, who were always watching for the approach of Pilgrims, came forward to receive their guests, and having shaken them cordially by the hand, welcomed them to their abode. And they also, like the Porter, had each her name, *Piety*, *Prudence*, and *Charity*, inscribed in capital letletters upon her forehead.

They were all clothed in long robes,* but that of each had something peculiar. She that was called Piety had her garment bordered with a wide fringe curiously wrought, and covered in many places with broad pieces of parchment on which were written various texts of scripture.* She that was called Prudence, wore a robe which was perpetually changing its colour to that of the objects nearest to it; and she that was called Charity, changed hers, as soon as the Pilgrims came in, to one of the same colour which they wore.

Thoughtful had some suspicions, from the discourse of the porter, that this was not the right house; and he wondered that the inhabitants should think it necessary to wear their names on their foreheads, in order to let their guests know who they were. But Ardent was so pleased with the idea of those great improvements of modern times, of which the porter had dropt a hint, and so desirous of knowing more about them, that he took but little notice of other things, and entered very cheerfully.

So the ladies conducted the Pilgrims into the house, with many expressions of great affection for them, and great joy at seeing them; and after they were seated in a spacious room, she that was called *Piety*, having taken the uppermost seat,‡ began as follows:

Lady.—We are greatly rejoiced to see you, and receive you to our dwelling. We have built this stately mansion at our own expense, that all men may see how much we love the Lord of the way, and all who set out on pilgrimage.§ And next to that pleasure which we continually derive from communion with the Lord of the way, and the assurance of

* Luke, xx. 46.

* Mat xxiii. 5. ‡ Mat. xxiii. 6.
§ Mat, xxiii. 5.

his love to *us*, is the delight we experience in the society of Pilgrims, and in pious conversation with them.

Ardent.—We are indeed highly favored in being received into such good company; and we shall doubtless enjoy a sweet season together.

Lady.—If your hearts flow out in love towards us, as ours do towards you, no doubt the meeting will be delightful. Only let us avoid all metaphysical and unprofitable subjects, and converse upon those which will increase our good feelings; and let all our remarks be addressed to the heart, and not to the head. We are extremely anxious to cultivate our pious feelings. We carefully avoid all addresses to the understanding, as likely to cool the ardor of our devotion. We do not wish to *think*—we wish to *feel*. But why have you not brought all your friends and acquaintances with you? We greatly desire to see the whole world going on pilgrimage.

Thoughtful.—And so do we. But we know that the carnal mind is enmity against the Lord of the way; and though we tried to persuade our friends to come with us, they would not hear.

Lady.—Rather say, they have not sufficient regard to their own happiness, and they misunderstand the character of the Lord of the way. For we do not think so ill of any as to suppose they would hate him if they knew that he is all love. Oh, he *is* good; for he has done *me* good all the days of my life, and given me assurance of his favor forever. Who would not love him, if they knew how desirous he is to make them happy? I think the reason more do not come, is because those who are sent to invite them do not take the right method. They do not represent the character of the King in a light sufficiently amiable to win men to love him. Instead of saying so much about the wrath of the King against his rebellious subjects, as some of his ambassadors do, they ought to dwell on his great mercy and kindness. Instead of representing him as a sovereign in the bestowment of his favors, they ought to represent him as treating all alike, doing no more for one than he does for another. And instead of calling upon them to submit themselves to the sovereign disposal of their King, they ought to tell them he only requires them to be willing to be made happy. If they would take this method, I have no doubt many more would be persuaded to make their future, instead of their present interest, their great object, and immediately to set out on pilgrimage. And many of the King's ambassadors are adopting this method of late, with great success.

Thoughtful was about to reply, when she that was called *Prudence* interrupted him, saying,

I have no patience with those servants of the Prince, of whom my sister has been speaking. Their business is to persuade men to go on pilgrimage: and they proceed as if their object was to prevent it. Men might be easily persuaded if it was not for the great imprudence of those who are sent forth for that purpose. It is a good maxim that men cannot be driven to the celestial city, but they can be allured. These imprudent men take the direct way to disgust their hearers, and stop their ears. If men are to be persuaded, they must first be pleased. But what

can be more displeasing to rebels against their King, than to represent the King as altogether in the right, and them as altogether in the wrong? What can be more provoking, than to tell them that they are altogether rebellious, and have no regard at all for their lawful Prince, even in their cries for mercy, when under fearful apprehensions of his wrath? What can be better adapted to fill them with indignation, than to tell them that they are condemned already, and the wrath of the King abideth on them; and that it depends upon his sovereign pleasure, whether any of them shall be pardoned or not? And what can be a greater outrage upon their feelings, than to tell them that he has already determined to show favor to some, not according to their works, but according to his own purpose and grace; and that he has also determined to treat others according to their deserts, and make them the monuments of his just vengeance forever? For my part, I wonder that any will be guilty of such gross imprudence; and I am astonished that men who advocate such gloomy, discouraging, and perplexing doctrines, are not forsaken and despised by all.

Thoughtful.—But, is it not the duty of the King's ambassadors to deliver their message faithfully, and declare the whole counsel of their Prince?

Lady.—In my opinion he is the most faithful ambassador of the King, who persuades the greatest number to set out on pilgrimage. I think he is to be most commended, who induces the most to listen to his message. I judge of the character of every ambassador by his success.

Thoughtful.—But this rule will condemn the Prince Immanuel himself, who, when he in person visited his rebellious subjects, had very little success in persuading them to return to their allegiance; and it will also condemn the conduct of those of his ambassadors who received their instructions from his own lips, and were eye witnesses of his conduct.

Lady.—No matter for that; times are altered—and great improvements have been made since those days. And besides, the most successful ambassador the Prince ever employed, has expressly told us that he became all things to all men in order to win them.

Thoughtful.—And yet this same ambassador used to teach all those things which you condemn as so imprudent and hurtful.

Lady.—He did, indeed, sometimes; but it usually exposed him to reproach and persecution. I think there is no need that the ambassadors of the King should expose themselves to the contempt and hatred of men, by following his example in these things. They ought to be more prudent than to dwell on these doubtful and disputable points, and disagreeable subjects. They ought to take pains to conciliate their hearers and gain their attention. They must make themselves popular if they wish to be useful; and to do this, they must accommodate themselves to the taste and opinions of their hearers, and not do violence to their prejudices. And I rejoice that many of them are adopting my sentiments, and practising according to my precepts.

Ardent had all along listened to the conversation with an earnest desire to be more particularly informed of the great improvements which have been made since the days of the Prince Immanuel and those immediately

instructed by him, and gladly embraced the opportunity which the renewed mention of them afforded of asking some further explanation. Then she that was called *Charity* undertook to answer him.

Lady.—It is with great pleasure that I hear you making such inquiries; for I consider it as evidence that you have a mind truly *liberal.* Some Pilgrims are so bigotted, that they will hear nothing about improvements being made in the statute book of the King. They are for retaining every thing just as it was written by the King's scribes. But I rejoice that the number of such narrow-souled bigots is small, and that liberality of sentiment is daily increasing.

Thoughtful.—I am surprised to hear *Charity* speak thus. I had been taught to believe that Charity rejoiced not in iniquity, but rejoiced in the *truth;* and that the King's statute book was the only infallible rule of truth and duty. But if I understand what you say, you rejoice that so many are disposed to disregard the authority of that book, and follow their own inclinations.

Lady.—I see that you are still under the influence of old prejudices; and I would very gladly remove them. A great part of that book is very dark and difficult to be understood, and needs a great deal of explanation; and men may innocently understand it in very different ways. It is my chief business to reconcile those of different opinions, and to show that one is as likely to be right as another. It is my opinion that the King has never required men to think alike on religious subjects, and that the various opinions entertained by those who go on pilgrimage are all equally agreeable to him, as they are all equally agreeable to me; unless, indeed, I except the opinions of those slaves of bigotry I mentioned, for these I abhor.

Thoughtful.—I had supposed it was the nature of charity to *wish well* to all men, and seek to promote their best good by bringing them to love and obey the statutes of the King; and that a right knowledge of these was necessary in order to love and obey them.

Lady.—Here, again, you discover the force of old prejudices. That, indeed, was the opinion formerly held; but it is entirely a mistake. It is the nature of charity to *think favorably* of all men, and indulge them all in following their own opinions, provided they will indulge us in following ours. I condemn nothing but bigotry; and that is rapidly declining, through the influence which I have already gained and am continually gaining. And I hope soon to see it forever destroyed, and all men united in one vast brotherhood, upon the basis of universal toleration. Then shall we see those happy days so long predicted and so ardently desired.

Thoughtful.—I had been led to expect those days would be introduced in a different manner; and that it would be, by the ambassadors' seeing eye to eye, and lifting up their voice together—by the universal belief and love of what is contained in the statute book of the King.

Lady.—No; it is only through my influence that those days can ever come. And those who are endeavoring to bring all men to think alike, are using the direct means of retarding their approach. But the influence of such men is declining. The greatest part of Pilgrims have submitted to my di-

rections, and but few are left who are so abominably selfish as to wish all to think as they do. Many of the King's ambassadors are concurring in my liberal opinions, and giving currency to my favorite maxims. It is also through my influence, that many of the old customs which were observed in receiving Pilgrims at the house Beautiful, have been abolished. It was ever thought necessary to make a particular and exact inquiry of Pilgrims, to know whether they had entered the way at the wicket gate; but it is entirely a matter of indifference to us, whether they came in by that gate or entered by some other. We seldom make any inquiries of that kind, unless in compliance with the prejudices of some who happen to be with us; and then, we take care that those inquiries shall not be so particular as to embarrass any applicant for admission. It was once thought necessary to examine Pilgrims, to know whether they had been at the house of the Interpreter, and had there obtained an accurate knowledge of the King's statutes, and did indeed cordially approve of them all; but this custom was in direct opposition to my most favorite maxim, which is, that it is no matter what pilgrims believe. And we, on the whole, rather prefer such as have not been at the house of the Interpreter to be prejudiced by his instructions which are so contrary to ours. It was once thought necessary to take particular care to ascertain the sincerity of Pilgrims, and to know whether they understood the character of the Lord of the way, and did cordially approve of it, and prefer the honor of his name to every thing else; but we greatly dislike all such scrutiny. It is enough for us that they profess to be ardently desirous of reaching the celestial city: and we never embarrass our guests by inquiring why they wish to go there. And if they say they love the Lord of the way, we never ask *why* they love him, or what views they have of his character.

By this time, I perceived that supper was ready, and the ladies said to the Pilgrims, "Come with us and partake of the feast of love." So they seated them at the table, which was covered with viands that seemed to promise a rich entertainment to the Pilgrims. But though the ladies helped them liberally from the various dishes, and bestowed high encomiums upon each kind of food, I perceived the Pilgrims partook sparingly, and found very little that was agreeable or nourishing. After supper some one of the company proposed to sing a hymn, and she that was called Charity selected the following as with her a favorite and most excellent hymn.

Father of all! in every age,
In every clime ador'd,
By Saint, by Savage, and by Sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

Thou great first cause, least understood;
Who all my sense confined
To know but this, that thou art good,
And that myself am blind.

What prudence dictates to be done,
Or warns me not to do;
This, teach me more than hell to shun,
That, more than heaven pursue,

What blessings thy free bounty gives,
Let me not cast away;
For God is paid, when man receives,—
T' enjoy, is to obey.

This hymn was sung by the three sisters with much animation; but I perceived that the Pilgrims did not join in it, not knowing the tune, and as I conjectured not entirely pleased with the sentiments.

The Pilgrims were then conducted to a chamber, over the

door of which was inscribed "*The Chamber of Peace.*"

So when they were alone, Thoughtful asked his companion what he thought now, of the place where they were.

Ardent.—I am entirely disappointed, and grieved. These cannot be the same persons who entertained the Pilgrim Christian. Oh, my brother, forgive me for urging you to come in.

Thoughtful.—I too am to blame; for I consented to enter while I was not satisfied that this was the right house. And I am now convinced that these are the three sisters against whose arts we were cautioned at the house of the Interpreter. Their true names are *Hypocrisy*, *Carnal-Policy*, and *Heresy*. But let us seek counsel where it is to be found.

So saying, he plucked his book out of his bosom, and read therein, as follows:—"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.—Take heed that ye be not deceived.—Woe to the women that sew pillows to all arm holes, and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls!—Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world—Ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware, lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness—Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." * * * *

BUNYANUS.

Obituary Notices.

From the Missionary Herald.

DEATH OF MR. FROST, AT BOMBAY.

THE following letter from Messrs. Hall and Graves, by an oversight was not dated; but we suppose the mournful event which it describes, happened in the month of October, a few days before the time that Mr. Fisk, in a distant part of the same great missionary field, finished his earthly career. The letter is addressed to the Corresponding Secretary.

Dear Sir:—The hopes expressed in our last letter concerning our now departed brother Frost, were but of very short continuance. After recovering so much, as to meet with us for business, and to resume a little his study of the language, and his labours in the mission, he was seized with more fatal symptoms. A cough, which commenced with his first illness, after some exposure in attending a funeral, never entirely left him; but it was so slight, as to occasion little concern, until he was seized with bleeding at the lungs. This returned after several intervals; and though the means used to prevent the recurrence of bleeding were at length successful, his other pulmonary symptoms continued to increase, and his strength gradually declined. On the 14th inst. from the discharge of an abscess, he exhibited every appearance of being in the agonies of death, but in the course of an hour he revived somewhat, and was able occasionally, to converse a little in a whisper, which he could do to

last. On Tuesday the 18th, ecame more restless, and sun set, without any special ations that he was in imme- danger of death, he said, nnot stay here, I must go," lmost in that instant expi-

us ended his life on earth: we have strong confidence, he then began to live with ints above, whom he longed n. In proof of this we have erely the evidence of a life ed to his Saviour, but also onversation of a dying be- r. This privilege, in regard r brethen Newell and Ni- , a holy providence, by the e of their diseases, in a measure denied us. But ere allowed intercourse with rother to the very entrance aven. Several days before leath, being confident he d continue but a short time, sired to see us all together. net accordingly, and united ging and prayer. At this ous season, he was not able dress us all collectively, but in a whisper to one of us, communicated his ideas to est. He requested if he had ded any of our feelings, to rgiven. He appeared very ionate, and much attached l our concerns, especially of the schools. He remark- hat his love for the mission been increasing; and on ano- occasion, he expressed a con- e, that it would prosper. id he had anticipated much ment in the missionary meet- which was about to take , but, not being able to at- he wished us to give his to all who should be pre-

ring his long illness, he ma- ed a child like submission and confidence in God, and much Christian humility. "How widely different," said he, in regard to his bodily suffering, "is my condition from that of those in hell, where I deserve to be." At other times, he said, "My life looks bad, but Jesus has washed me." "I may continue a day or two, but it is better to depart." In reply to the question, whether his desire to depart arose chiefly from his bodily pains, he said, "I wish to be where I shall serve God day and night." His emotions were at no time peculiarly rapturous, but he enjoyed a continual and steady confidence.

Having seen and felt, that there is a superabundance of missionary labor for Christian females in this country, and on inquiry found that Mrs. Frost was desirous of remaining and labouring here after his decease, he expressed the highest gratification. He said he hoped she would not dishonour God by undue sorrow. On seeing her weep, he said, "Weep not for me, but for the heathen." He manifested an exquisite delight, especially towards the close of his illness, in prayer, and in uniting with others in that duty, and in hearing the Scriptures read, and praises sung.

We have, therefore, occasion to mourn only for ourselves, thus early deprived of one, who would have zealously aided us in pointing out to the heathen the only way to life eternal. On these accounts, we would be humbled and mourn. We entreat the churches to fill up our vacancies, and to do more than fill them.

As the chapel was on the way to our burying ground, brother Frost's remains were conveyed there, and an address made in English, and one in Mahratta, with prayers and singing. A con-

siderable number both of Europeans and natives were present.

We remain yours in the service of our blessed Saviour.

G. HALL,
A. GRAVES."

Mr. Frost, who has been called thus early from his labors, possessed qualities as a man and as a Christian, which ensured to him the love and confidence of his associates, and would have rendered him, had he lived long enough to acquire the Mahratta language, a very useful missionary. The great purpose of his life, during all his studies preparatory to the Gospel Ministry, and subsequently until his death, manifestly was to comply with the requisitions of duty.

On the 25th September, 1823, Mr. Frost received ordination in Salem, Mass.; and on the 27th, embarked at that place, with his wife, and Mrs. Graves for Calcutta. There they arrived early in the March following. After remaining in that city a fortnight, they embarked again for Madras and Bombay, and arrived at the latter place June 28th, nine months after leaving Boston. Mr. Frost's connexion with the mission was, therefore, scarcely of a year and a half continuance.

He was, we believe, a native of Brattleborough, Vt., where his mother still resides. His father died not many weeks since.—The parents of Mrs. Frost are inhabitants of Chester, N. H.

DEATH OF MR. SESSIONS.

Died, on the coast of Africa, March 2, on board brig Vine, Mr. HORACE SESSIONS, American Missionary, who accompanied the coloured colonists who sailed from Boston in Jan. last for Liberia.

Intelligence.

LATE FROM THE AFRICAN COLONY.

An introductory sheet of the "Liberia Herald," dated Monrovia, Feb. 16th, has been received in Boston. It contains a Prospectus of the paper which is to be published under that title, once in two weeks, commencing as soon as 200 subscribers shall be obtained. Price, $1 per annum in advance, or $1,50 in 6 months. The Editorial department is to be under the particular supervision of the Agent, while the business of printing will be conducted by Mr. CHARLES L. FORCE, who recently went out from Boston.

Besides the Prospectus, the present sheet contains an account of the arrival of the Vine on the 7th of February; also, a description of a visit made by the Agent and several of the Colonists to Grand Colo, New Sesters, and Grand Bassa, for the inspection of the factories in possession of the Colony in that quarter,—from which they returned on the 13th, after an absence of three weeks. The substance of these articles we copy below. We would mention as particularly worthy of notice, what is said of the eagerness of all the Leeward Tribes except one, to receive instruction. For *this* at least, Ethiopia is already stretching forth her hands.

From the Liberia Herald of Feb. 16.

ARRIVAL OF THE NEW-ENGLAND EXPEDITION.

ON the 7th inst., the brig Vine, Capt. Grozier, arrived at this port in 34 days from Boston, with Colonists for Liberia. We are

y to assure our American
ls that the officers and crew,
:ev. Mr. Sessions,* and Rev.
Iolton the missionary, and
orce, Printer, together with
ıe Colonists, are in perfect
h, and have been unusually
cted of Heaven from the
:rs of the deep, and from the
ɛs of disease.

.ey were welcomed by our
ns by the discharge of artil-
by acclamations of joy, and
owds at the wharf, ready to
ıct them to their dwellings.
landing of the people and
ınloading of the brig, were
ted without an accident. The
ıists have all been admitted
:e citizens of Liberia, drawn
town lots and plantations,
)een located temporarily in
:nient houses generously of-
them by our citizens till
can erect their own.

: understand that they are
y pleased with the healthi-
ınd progress of the Colony,
to use their own words,
that they have now got
."

ın follows a statement of the ar-
" so liberally contributed for the
the Colony by our friends in
England."

ıll this may be viewed as an
of the state of feeling in
England, it must be most
ying to the American Colo-
on Society, and furnishes a
e never before given, that
ı is to arise from her degra-
ı, and this Colony to receive
pulse which no subsequent
er can effect.

:DITION TO GRAND COLO, &c.

ıong the objects accomplish-
r this excursion are the con-
ın of a treaty of amity and
trade with the king of Grand Colo, from which places, as the first fruits of the new arrangement, a full schooner load of rice and oil sent by the Agent, arrived even before his own return to the Cape. The resources of that country are found to be abundant, and its accession to the new relation which it now sustains to the Colony, promises to the latter, important advantages. Grand Colo, it will be perceived, from a map of the coast, is the country contiguous to the dominions of king Wilson, (or West,) on the south-east, whose transactions in the slave traffic, are second in extent only to those of Siaca Galinas. Trade-town, the grand mart of slaves on this line of the coast, is brought within the station at which the influence of the Colony may be now considered as partially established.

The Agent was induced by various reasons, not yet proper to be fully disclosed, to visit Trade-town. The number of slaves, at present waiting their despatch at this place, is 300; the whole number had been collected in the short space of 4 weeks. King Wilson having acquired his consequence by means of this traffic, discovers no inclination to abandon it for any other pursuit; and regards the progress of juster views on the subject, beginning to prevail among the adjoining tribes, with a mixture of concern and indignation.

His next neighbor, King Freeman, of New Sesters, from whom the Colony has obtained the grant of an extensive territory, and other valuable privileges, and where it has the oldest of its remote establishments, has given, in the present instance, several fresh proofs of the sincerity in which his former transactions with

[r. S. it will be recollected, died homeward passage.—*Eds.*

the Agent have been conducted. It is confidently expected that an invaluable acquisition of territory will very shortly be secured to the Colony in that quarter by simple purchase.

It is most gratifying to find, (as the Agent has, in this excursion,) an eager desire expressed by all the leeward tribes, except Wilson's people, for the immediate establishment of schools among them for the instruction of their children in the English language and letters. It is the opinion of the Agent, that at least three schools in that quarter would be wholly supported by the King and head-men of the country, provided instructors could be furnished them. The part of the coast visited, presents a population, it is believed, fully equal to any section of Western Africa in which the slave trade prevails to an equal extent; the lands are drier, and of more uniform fertility than in the immediate vicinity of the Cape; and could Christianity and the arts once gain an effectual introduction, it is not possible to picture a richer scene of moral and physical wealth and beauty than this delightful region offers to the imagination which surveys it.

Ordinations and Installations.

April 12,—Rev. MILTON P. BRAMAN was ordained Pastor of the 1st Church in Danvers. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Braman, of Rowley.

April 17,—Rev. WILLIAM A. SAVAGE was ordained as an Evangelist by the New York Presbytery. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Patton.

April 20.—Rev. EBENEZER MASON was ordained to the work of the Gospel Ministry by the New York Presbytery. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Knox.

May 10,—Rev. CHARLES BOYTER was ordained in Sharon, as an Evangelist. Introductory prayer by Rev. Mr. Coggswell of Deddam; Sermon by Rev. Mr. Burgess of Dedham; Consecrating Prayer by Rev. Dr. Park, of Wrentham; Charge by Rev. Mr. Fisk, of Wrentham; Right-hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr. Curtis, of Sharon; Concluding Prayer by Rev. Mr. Peirce, of Foxborough

May 10,—Messrs. ELI SMITH, JOSIAH BREWER, CYRUS STONE, and JEREMIAH STOW, were ordained at Springfield, Mass. as Missionaries to the heathen. These gentlemen are to be employed under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Mr. Smith proceeds immediately to Malta, to be associated with Mr. Temple in conducting the Printing Establishment. The destination of the others has not yet been definitively assigned.—At the same time the Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, Assistant Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, was ordained as an Evangelist.—Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Fay, of Charlestown.

May 17,—Mr. WAKEFIELD GALE was ordained at Salem, Mass. as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Burnham, of Pembroke, N. H. Mr. Gale is to be employed as a Missionary in the eastern part of Maine.

Rev. REUBEN SMITH has been ordained as Pastor of the second Congregational Church in Burlington, Vt.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. JULY, 1826. No. 7.

WISDOM OF GOD IN THE PLAN OF CREATION.—A SERMON.

PSALM CIV. 24.—*O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.*

David took peculiar pleasure in tracing all secondary causes up to the first and supreme Cause. He discovered the finger and wisdom of God in all the works of creation. He said unto God, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" He appeared to himself, to be one of the least of the works of creation, and unworthy of the notice of the infinite Creator, whose wisdom excited his admiration and astonishment, which he expresses in the strongest terms in the text. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all."

As it is the *greatness* of the works of God, that most clearly displays his *power*, so it is the *variety* of his works, that most clearly displays his *wisdom*. In contemplating the works of God separately, we discover nothing but power in creating and preserving every thing that exists; but in contemplating his works in their variety, connexion, and relation to one another, we discover his great and incomprehensible wisdom. Though David could not discover *all* the wisdom of God in all his works; yet he could and did discover so much of his wisdom as to convince him, that they were all designed to answer a benevolent and important end, which afforded him great satisfaction and delight. For he observes in the conclusion of the Psalm, "I will be glad in the Lord; my meditation of him shall be sweet." The text taken in its proper connexion, or as an independent sentence, warrants us to conclude,

That God exercised his wisdom in forming the plan of creation. I shall,

I. Show what we are to understand by the wisdom of God.

II. Show when he formed the plan of creation.

III. Show that he exercised his wisdom in forming it.

IV. Show that it is the best plan possible.

I. I am to show what we are to understand by the wisdom of God. The scripture represents God as being possessed of both natural and moral attributes or perfections, which are essential to his existence. These perfections, though inseparably *connected* with each other, are nevertheless absolutely distinct. His wisdom is a *natural* perfection distinct from all his other natural perfections, which have no intrin-

sic *moral* excellence in them. It is distinct from his self existence, his omnipresence, his omniscience, and his omnipotence. Each of these natural perfections is destitute of any moral excellence. God is not morally excellent, merely because he exists in and of himself, without any *exterior* cause or necessity out of himself; nor is he morally excellent, because he exists every where and his presence is universal and unlimited; nor is he morally excellent, because his understanding is infinite and he knows all things; nor is he morally excellent, because he is omnipotent, or has almighty power and can do every thing that power can do; nor is he morally excellent, because he is possessed of supreme and incomprehensible wisdom. All these natural perfections are entirely distinct from his *holiness*, which comprises his goodness, his justice, his mercy, his truth, and his faithfulness. These *moral* perfections are inseparably connected with his natural, and spread a moral beauty, excellence, and glory over all his great and amiable character. But his *wisdom*, though connected with, is distinct from all these divine attributes. It is a natural attribute, which resembles that intellectual faculty in man that is called wisdom. It is by wisdom, men form their best designs, and devise the best means to accomplish them. By wisdom in God, therefore, we are not to understand his power, nor any other perfection of his nature, but simply his capacity of investigating, devising, and forming the best designs, and the best means of carrying them into execution. I now proceed to show,

II. When God formed the plan of creation. Men who are intelligent moral agents, always form their design of acting *before* they begin to act. So, the allwise God formed his design of acting *before he began to* act. Though he never began to exist, yet he did begin to act. He did not choose to exist before he began to exist, but he did choose to act before he began to act. He formed his design of creation, not of necessity, but choice. He was under no natural necessity of creating any thing, much less of creating *all* things. He might, if he had pleased, existed alone from eternity unto eternity, without ever bringing any creature or any object into existence. As he formed his plan of creation, of choice, so he formed just such a plan of creation as he chose to form. He took as many worlds, and creatures, and objects into his plan as he chose to take in, and no more. His plan was one, connected, comprehensive plan, which comprized all things that he ever intended to create. Men are so limited in their power and knowledge, and so mutable in their designs, that they are incapable of forming one, uniform, connected, comprehensive design, which leads them to form new and inconsistent designs from time to time. But God, whose understanding was infinite from eternity, was able to form a plan of creation, which he could never see any reason, nor have any desire to enlarge, or to diminish, or to alter, in the least respect. And such a plan he did form *before* he began the great work of creation.

This leads me to show,

III. That God exercised his *wisdom* in forming this great, complicated, and comprehensive plan. So the Psalmist thought, and said. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in *wisdom* hast thou made them all." It was the wisdom of God alone, which he exercised in

forming the plan of creation. It is the part of wisdom to form any plan, scheme, or design of any operation; and the part of power to carry it into execution. God, to speak with reverence, could not have formed the plan, the scheme, or design of creation, by his knowledge, his power, and even his goodness, without the exercise of his wisdom. Though God knew enough, had power enough, and goodness enough, to do all things possible; yet it was only his wisdom that could dictate what and how many of things possible, it was *best* he should actually bring into existence. It belonged to his wisdom to direct him, how to employ his knowledge, his power, and his goodness in creation, so as to answer the most desirable and important end. The best of men often fail of employing their knowledge, their power, and their goodness to the best advantage, for want of wisdom to form the best designs. It was owing to the want of wisdom in David, that he formed the design of building the temple, which God would not allow him to execute. The knowledge, the power, and the goodness of a great many men surpass their wisdom to form great and good designs, by which they are prevented from doing all the good in the world, which they desire to do. God's design, in the work of creation, was subordinate to his supreme and ultimate design in the work of redemption. And this work the apostle expressly ascribes to the incomprehensible wisdom of God. He says, "Unto me, who am the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who *created* all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the *church* the *manifold wisdom* of God, according to *his eternal purpose* which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." God would not have created the world, had it not been for a greater and nobler design of raising up from the ruins of the apostacy monuments of his sovereign and distinguishing mercy through the medium of the work of redemption. And he was governed, in devising this great and gracious design, by his manifold, infinite wisdom. It was owing to the exercise of this perfection, that he formed his supreme and ultimate design of displaying all his other perfections in the work of redemption.

It now remains to show,

IV. That God not only formed *a* plan; but the *best* plan possible of creation. It is almost universally acknowledged, that God did form *a* plan of creation, before he began to create, or brought any being or object into existence; but it is not so universally acknowledged, that the plan he formed was the best plan possible. Many among all denominations have either denied, or doubted, whether the plan of creation which God devised and adopted from eternity is the best that could be formed, or the best that he could have formed. This question has long been agitated, and more especially of late. Some think there is an absurdity in supposing, that God *could* form the best possible plan of creation. They say it is limiting the infinite wisdom of God, to suppose that the plan of creation which he did form, was the best possible plan. For this would imply that he could not have formed

some other plan, that would have been equally good. They say it is absurd to suppose, that among all possible plans that could be devised, any one could be found *better* than any of the rest, or so good that no other could be equally good; and therefore they deny, that God did from eternity form the best possible plan of creation. Since some very learned and ingenious divines deny, that God's original plan of creation is the best one possible, it is of importance to establish the truth of this doctrine. And the truth of it will appear, if we consider the following observations.

1. There was, in the nature of things, *one* plan of creation absolutely the *best*. It is not possible to conceive, that there should have been *two different* plans of creation equally good. We can conceive of two, or ten, or ten thousand globes being exactly alike, except a *numerical* difference. But we cannot conceive of two, or ten, or ten thousand plans or schemes of action being exactly *alike*, and yet *numerically different*. If they are exactly *alike*, they are not *numerically* different, but really *one* and the *same* plan or scheme of conduct. There was, therefore, from eternity *one best possible plan* of creation, and no different one *better*, nor so good. So that if God formed any plan of creation from eternity, he must necessarily have formed the *best* possible plan, or a different one, which could not be so good.

2. If there was one best possible plan of creation that could be devised, we must suppose that God, who was infinitely wise from eternity, was able to devise that one best possible plan. There was nothing in eternity, to prevent his exercising all his wisdom in devising the plan of creation. He was self-existent, independent, and uncontrollable by any other being, or object in the universe. He was at perfect liberty to form or not form any plan of creation. And if he chose to form a plan of creation, he was at liberty to exercise all his wisdom in forming it. And if he did exercise his infinite wisdom in forming the plan of creation, we must suppose he actually did form the best possible plan in the nature of things. He was omniscient. He knew himself, and in knowing himself he knew all things possible. And among the vast variety of ends that could be devised in the plan of creation, his infinite wisdom could not fail to discover the *very best*.

3. When his infinite wisdom discovered the best possible plan of creation, he was morally obliged to choose and adopt it. God is a free, moral agent; and though no other being can oblige him to do what his perfect wisdom dictates to be wisest and best; yet he can lay himself under moral obligation to do what is wisest and best for him to do. He sees more clearly than any other being, what is morally right and morally wrong; what is wise and unwise; what is most for his own glory; and what is best for the whole intelligent universe. And this knowledge of what is right, wisest, and best, carries with it a moral obligation, to do what is right, wisest, and best. For it is as true in respect to God, as in respect to man, "To him that *knoweth* to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." The immutable rectitude of God, obliged him to devise the best possible plan of creation. In the view of all things possible, and of all plans possible, he felt bound to adopt the wisest and best plan possible, in the work of creation.

When he saw how many worlds, how many angels and men, and how many living creatures he was able to create; he might have gone on creating from eternity unto eternity, had not his *wisdom* assumed its office, and precisely determined how many worlds and how many creatures it was best to create, in order to form one, connected, consistent, and best possible system. Such a uniform, limited system, infinite wisdom must have dictated, and pronounced to be the best possible one. And after this decision of infinite wisdom, God felt himself no longer at liberty to form any other plan, scheme, or design in the creation of the world, than that which he saw to be absolutely the *wisest and best.*

4. As the infinite wisdom and immutable moral rectitude of God laid him under inviolable obligation, to devise the best plan possible; so his essential goodness or benevolence *disposed* him freely and voluntarily to choose and adopt that wisest and best plan of creation. Men often know how to form wise and good designs, and feel themselves bound to form them; but at the same time have not goodness enough to adopt them. But infinite goodness is as essential to the divine character, as infinite wisdom and immutable moral rectitude. He is as good as he is wise; and always disposed to promote the highest holiness and happiness of the whole system of moral beings. When his infinite wisdom, therefore, proposed the best possible plan to promote the highest good of the universe, his boundless goodness, disposed him to choose and immutably fix and establish the plan, which clearly appeared to be the wisest and best possible. Mankind always do whatever they are *able* to do, and *choose* to do. No instance to the contrary ever did, or ever can take place. And this holds equally true in regard to the Deity. He always does what he is both *able* and *willing* to do. If he was both *able* and *willing* in eternity, to form and adopt the wisest and best possible plan of creation, it is morally certain, that he actually did form and adopt that perfect plan, and no other. If any further evidence of the truth of this important doctrine is necessary, I would observe,

5. That no defect or imperfection ever has been found, or ever can be found in God's original and eternal plan of creation. It has been attentively and critically examined for nearly six thousand years, by the greatest, wisest, and best created beings, who have never discovered the least defect or imperfection in it. Angels have desired, and enjoyed great liberty and opportunity of looking into the plan of creation and redemption, and the more they have examined and contemplated it, the more they have admired its superlative wisdom and goodness. Isaiah, in a vision of heaven, heard the seraphim "cry one to another and say, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory." And John in a vision heard them say, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things; and for thy pleasure they are and were created." These were public and solemn declarations of the perfect wisdom, glory, and moral excellence of the plan and execution of the works of creation, providence, and grace. Had the angels ever discovered any defect of wisdom, or goodness, in the plan or works of creation, they never would have so often

and so highly celebrated them, with so much gratitude and praise. David, who delighted in contemplating the designs and works of God, cried out in ecstacy, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in *wisdom* hast thou made them all." And in a multitude of other places in the book of Psalms, he calls upon himself and others, to admire, and bless, and praise the Lord, "for all his goodness and wonderful works to the children of men." Paul, speaking of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, or plan of redemption contained in the plan of creation, exclaims in a rapture of gratitude and admiration, "Now, unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only *wise* God, be honour and glory forever and ever, Amen." Angels, and prophets, and apostles, would never have spoken in such lofty strains of the *wisdom* of God in the plan of creation, if after their most attentive and impartial examination of it, they had discovered the least defect or imperfection in it. Satan, the first, the greatest, and most subtle adversary of God, has had as much opportunity, as much capacity, and as much occasion, to examine the plan of creation, as any other created being in the universe; but we have no evidence that he ever did, or could discover any defect or imperfection in it. If he did, or could discover any defect or imperfection in it, we might expect that he would have made it known to wicked men, whom he so often tempts and assists in raising objections against the gospel. There is reason to think he has suggested some of the most subtle and plausible objections against christianity, that deists and infidels have ever made. Though they have pretended to find a vast many defects and imperfections in the works of creation, providence, and grace, yet they have never pointed out any, that have the least tendency to invalidate the evidence in favour of the absolute perfection of the divine plan in creation, drawn from the infinite wisdom and goodness of God. Though many suppose, that all the natural and moral evils in the world, are so many defects and imperfections in the divine plan of creation and providence, and consequently that God would have formed a better plan, if he had excluded from it all natural and moral evil. But who can prove, that such a plan would have been better, or so good, as the plan we know God did form from eternity, under the influence of infinite wisdom and goodness? The more the wisest and most profound philosophers have searched into the works and laws of nature, the more they have been convinced that they are calculated to promote the good of mankind. They have been able to make it clearly to appear, that many things which have been deemed useless and worse than useless, and even noxious and destructive, are really useful and necessary to promote the general benefit of the world; and there is ground to expect, that as they make further and deeper researches into the nature and tendency of material objects, they will discover more and more their utility and importance; and so be able to remove many objections which infidels have made against the wisdom and goodness of God in the frame and constitution of the material world. But, if after all their researches some things should remain dark and unaccountable, this would only prove that God is wiser than man. As to the *moral* evils in the world, men have no reason to complain

of God; for if they were what they ought to be, these would cease to exist. But the gospel represents the *plan* of redemption as designed and adapted to overrule all the moral evils in this world to the highest good of the universe, in a future and eternal state. Now, if we take all the observations together which have been made, and consider, that God was in eternity at perfect liberty to form, or not to form the plan of creation; that he did then form a plan of creation; that he exercised his infinite *wisdom* in forming the plan; that his perfect moral rectitude laid him under moral obligation to form the best possible plan; and that his infinite goodness or benevolence disposed him to choose the best possible plan; they must amount *to a moral demonstration*, that God did actually form and establish the *best possible plan* of creation. All the objections, therefore, which have been made, or can be made against this *perfect plan* of creation, by angels or men, must be founded in their *ignorance* and *incapacity* to comprehend *the manifold wisdom of God* in the plan of creation and redemption.

[The application in our next number.]

For the Christian Magazine.

IS IT THE DUTY OF SAINTS TO PRAY FOR PERFECTION IN HOLINESS IN THIS LIFE?

Previously to a solution of this question, it seems necessary to fix the precise meaning and import of it. Prayer to God necessarily involves the idea of dependence upon him; for there is no propriety in praying to him for the production of a certain event, unless that event in some measure depends upon his power and agency. Accordingly when a saint prays for perfection in holiness, his very prayer supposes that the divine agency is requisite to produce this effect in his heart. Hence his prayer solely respects God's conduct and not his own. Therefore the question is not, whether saints ought *to be* perfect, but whether they ought *to pray* that God would make them so in this life.

Now taking the question in this sense, we must answer it in the negative, for this plain reason,—that God has determined not to make saints perfectly holy in this life. That this is the divine determination, I shall not stand to prove, since it is readily conceded by all; but only endeavour to deduce the consequence from this concession, or show that it cannot be the duty of saints to pray for that which they know God will not grant. And this will appear, if we consider—1. That praying for any thing contrary to the divine determination is implicitly praying that the divine purposes may be altered or counteracted. But God's purposes and designs being the wisest and best that can be, to ask him to alter or counteract them, must be, in the highest degree, absurd and criminal. How can a saint, therefore, pray for perfection in this life, contrary to the known will of God, without being guilty of direct rebellion against him?

2. A saint cannot pray in faith for perfection, contrary to the known will of God. God hath declared that his counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure; and that he is of one mind and none can turn him. Therefore a saint must know, if he asks for perfection in this life, that he shall certainly be denied. But how can a person pray in *faith* for that which he knows God will never

grant? Can such a prayer be any thing less than profane trifling and solemn mockery of God?

3. God forbids men's praying for that which they know he will not grant. Jeremiah was forbidden to pray for the deliverance of his people in a certain case; because God told him that he would not hear his prayer: Jer. vii. 16. "Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me." The reason is added: "For I will not hear thee." God likewise forbids us to pray for any who have committed the unpardonable sin; because he is determined never to forgive them either in this world or that which is to come. Now can any reason be given for God's forbidding men's praying contrary to his known determination in one case rather than in another? If not, then these prohibitions forbid saints' praying for perfection, or any other thing contrary to the known will of God.

4. It is no more the duty of saints to pray for perfection in this life, than to pray for the conversion and salvation of reprobate spirits now in the prison of despair. None suppose it is right to pray for them. But why? Are they not still capable of enjoying happiness? Is not God still able to renew and sanctify them? Is not the atonement of Christ still sufficient for their pardon and forgiveness? Or has God forbidden us to pray for their deliverance and salvation? Why then may we not still pray for those miserable creatures? The only reason is, that God has let us know that the sentence which he passed upon them is fixed and irreversible. But if saints ought not to pray for the salvation of damned spirits contrary to the divine determination, then they ought not to pray for their own perfection in holiness in this life contrary to the unchangeable determination of the Deity.

These considerations, it is apprehended, sufficiently prove that saints ought not to pray for perfection in this life. However, since specious objections are made against the sentiment, it may be proper to consider several of the principal ones distinctly.

Ob. 1. It is the duty of saints to *desire* perfection in this life, and therefore it is their duty to pray for it.

Though saints may desire perfection in this life as an excellent attainment in its own nature; yet they may not desire nor pray for perfection as an event, contrary to the divine determination. This distinction is plain and obvious. There are many things desirable in their *own nature*, which are not desirable as *events*, and vice versa. It is desirable in its *own nature* to be free from pain, but not always desirable as an *event*. It is desirable in its *own nature* that there should be no *sin* in the world, but not desirable as an event. It is desirable in its *own nature* that every sinner should be saved, and God himself desires it, but not as an *event*, if he did, he would bring it to pass. And thus saints may desire perfection in this life in its own nature, but not desire it nor pray for it as an event contrary to the known will of God.

Ob. 2. If saints ought to *be* perfect, then they ought to *pray* that God would make them so in this life.

We readily grant that saints ought to be perfect in this life; but deny that it hence follows that they ought to pray for perfection here. For their duty to *be* perfect results from the reason and nature

of things, or from their being what they are, and God's being what he is, without any regard to the divine determination. But their *praying* for perfection is either a duty, or not, as God has or has not determined to make them perfect. Thus the devils and damned spirits are obliged in the reason and nature of things to be perfect in holiness; but who will infer hence that they ought to pray that God would make them perfect, contrary to his own immutable decree?

Ob. 3. It is no more contrary to the divine determination for saints to *pray* for perfection in this life, than to *be* perfect in this life.

To which it may be replied, That this objection is built upon a false supposition—that saints may become perfect of *themselves* without the divine agency; which, if true, would prove that saints ought not to pray to God for any holiness at all.

Ob. 4. To say that saints should not pray for perfection in this life, is the same as to say that they should indulge themselves in sin; for the least imperfection in holiness is sinful.

To which it is easy to reply, That saints may heartily hate all sin and *desire* perfect freedom from it, simply considered; and yet neither desire nor pray for perfection as an *event* which is contrary to the divine will. Let me ask the objector, who, I will suppose, is a real saint,—suppose you pray for perfection to-day, but to-morrow find your request is denied, how should you feel with respect to God's conduct? As to your own, it is evident you should feel penitent and self-condemned. But how, I say, should you feel with respect to God's conduct? Should you not feel submissive? and would not such submission be a holy exercise and directly opposite to the love of sin in its own nature?

Ob. 5. God's determination is no rule for *our* conduct, but only for *his own*.

To which it may be replied,—That though God's determination is not a rule for *our* conduct in *all cases*, yet in some cases it is. It is always a rule for our conduct as to the taking place of events. All events depend upon the divine determination; and therefore we should pray, that such, and only such events should take place, as God has determined shall take place. Consequently if saints know that their perfection in this life, is an event which God has determined shall not take place, then they ought not to pray that it might, however desirable it may be in its own nature. Such duties as result from the reason and nature of things, depend not upon the divine determination; but all other duties do, and therefore it is the duty of saints to *be* perfect, let God's determination be what it may; but it is not their duty to *pray* for perfection as an event contrary to the known will of God.

Ob. 6. Some passages of scripture require saints to pray for perfection in this life.

Upon this it may be observed, in the first place, that if the foregoing observations are just, then the texts referred to must be explained in some other sense; and in the second place, that they will admit of a more easy and natural construction. When the scripture speaks of Noah, Job, or any other saint, as being perfect, we know the word *perfect* is not used in the strictest sense, but only as denoting reality of grace, sincerity of affection, or, at most, some eminent degrees of holiness. Accord-

ingly when the scriptures exhort men to pray for perfection, it must be understood of that perfection which God has granted and will grant to saints in this life, and not complete freedom from all sin.

N.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE LORD'S SUPPER AN ORDINANCE OF THE CHURCH.

By Christians in New England, the Lord's Supper has ever been regarded as an ordinance of the *Church*. A distinction has been recognized between the church and the congregation; and while both have attended upon the common services of public worship, the *church* only have been invited to the table of the Lord. But the present is an age in which, with many, it argues nothing in favor of a particular practice, that it has been long established. The most authoritative examples, as well as the plainest divine precepts, are called in question, and we are obliged to contend, not for the scaffolding or the outworks of our spiritual temple, but for the foundation itself. In respect to the Lord's supper, it has been lately said, that "we have no more reason to approach this ordinance with trembling and hesitancy, or with any constraint of mind; we have no more occasion for preparatory *lectures*, or preparatory *meditations*; we have no more business to shut it up to a peculiar and chosen few; than we have to treat in a similar manner any of the services of the sanctuary. We have as much right to stand upon the threshold of a church, and to forbid any worshipper to enter, as we have to stand before the communion table, and forbid him to approach—as much right to warn men from the observance of the Sabbath itself, as to warn them from the observance of the Lord's supper."*

In these extracts, the Lord's supper is placed entirely on a level with the common services of religion, and all who assemble for public worship are regarded as entitled, by that very act, to communion at the table of the Redeemer. Accordingly, in several religious societies in this Commowealth, the whole congregation are regularly invited to the sacrament of the supper; and this practice is likely to become still more general, and perhaps universal, among those who style themselves liberal Christians. It is time, therefore, that the practice should be examined, and if it be unscriptural, that it be exposed and refuted.

The question to be discussed may be expressed as follows: *Are all those, who attend public worship, to be regarded as qualified for communion at the Lord's table?* Or, *does the fact of attending public worship amount to such a profession of religion, as may be justly required of communicants?* Or (which is in effect the same) *is the common distinction between church and congregation authorized in the scriptures, and worthy to be continued?* In reply, I observe,

1. That the distinction between church and congregation *is* authorized in the scriptures, and consequently ought to be continued.—We have evidence of this, in the literal meaning of the word translated *church*. This word is derived from two others, which signify to *call forth*. The church is a body *called forth* and *separated* from some larger and more general body. This larger body is the *congregation*, the *world*,

* Christian Examiner, vol. iii. p. 9.

from which the church is, by its very name, distinguished.—The account furnished in the New Testament of the manner in which the *first churches were gathered*, corresponds with this signification of the term, which was applied to them.

From the vast congregations, which sometimes attended on the ministry of the Saviour, he *called forth* and *separated* his disciples, who constituted the first christian church. From the mixed multitude who assembled on the day of Pentecost, three thousand were *separated*, and added to the Lord. When many of those, who heard Paul at Ephesus, "were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and *separated* the disciples." He separated them from the mixed congregation, and they became a Christian church.—That the common distinction between church and congregation is authorized in the New Testament, is demonstrably *certain*, from the fact of *excommunication*. It will not be doubted, that provision is made in the New Testament for the exclusion of unworthy members from the church; or for what is commonly called their *excommunication*. But if there were no distinction between the church and the congregation, what did this act of the church import? What was done to the excommunicated person? Was he henceforth debarred from attending public worship, and from appearing in a christian assembly? Was he never more to be favored with any of the means of grace? This cannot be seriously pretended. The excommunicated person was not separated from the privilege of public worship, and of attending on the ordinary means of grace—a privilege granted at all times to heathens and publicans, to the vilest and the worst of men—he was separated merely from the communion and privileges of the *church*. There was therefore a known distinction then, as there should always be, between the congregation and the church. The church was a *select*, *separate* company. Its members were known by *names*, such as *disciples*, *brethren*, *believers*, *saints*—names which were applied to no other persons. And all who attended public worship were *not* regarded as disciples and brethren, or as qualified for the special communion of the people of God.—Having established, as I think conclusively, this first point, I observe,

2. We have evidence, not only that the church, in the primitive age, was distinct from the congregation, but of the *ground* on which the distinction or separation was made. This was *evidence of faith*, or a *visible*, *credible profession of piety*. It was "those, who *gladly received the word*," and "who continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers"—those, in short, who *gave evidence of piety*, who were baptised, and received into the church, on the day of Pentecost. Immediately after, we read that "the Lord added to the church daily *such as should be saved*"—such as possessed, and appeared to possess, that *piety*, which is the condition of salvation. It was not till the Samaritans "*believed* Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of Christ," and in this way furnished evidence of *piety*, that they were baptised, and admitted to the church. When the eunuch expressed a desire for baptism, Philip replied to him, "*If thou believest with all thy heart*,

thou mayest. And the eunuch answered and said, I *believe* that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The Holy Ghost fell on the family of Cornelius, and thus satisfied Peter of their *piety*, before he would receive them to the church, and administer to them the ordinances of the gospel. Ananias objected to baptising Paul, till a voice from heaven assured him of the *piety* of this former persecutor. "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." After the baptism of Lydia and her household, she said to Paul and his company, "If ye have *judged me to be faithful to the Lord*, come into my house, and abide there." The Epistles to the Churches all proceed on the supposition that the members were *saints*, at least by profession. "*Holy brethren*, partakers of the heavenly calling" —"*Beloved of God*, called to be saints"—"To the *saints*, and *faithful brethren* in Christ"—this is the style, in which the apostles addressed the primitive churches, necessarily implying, that all their members were professedly *pious*. Persons destitute of piety sometimes gained admission to the apostolical churches; but the manner in which they are spoken of shows, that they came in by deceit, and had no right there. They are said to "have *crept in, unawares*." Barriers were erected to keep the irreligious out; but by deception or stealth, some of this character had "*crept in unawares*." —I have previously shown, that there was a wide distinction in the primitive age, between the church and the congregation; and we here see the *ground* on which this distinction was made. It was on the ground of *visible piety*. Those who appeared and professed to be truly pious, and who desired admission to the churches, were admitted; but those who were unable to exhibit evidence of their piety, were rejected.—I now advance another step, and observe,

3. That none, but *members of the churches*, were admitted by the apostles to the table of the Lord. —The Lord's supper is an ordinance of the church. It is in the strictest sense *peculiar* to the church. The church would not have been constituted a distinct body, had not some service or ordinance been appointed and annexed to it, as its peculiar property, and as a visible mark of its separate existence. But we have no ordinance more sacred, or more specially the property of the church, than the holy supper. Accordingly we read, in the New Testament, of its being specially appropriated to the disciples of Jesus. When the supper was instituted, "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the DISCIPLES, and said, Take, eat, this is my body." And when Paul was at Troas, "upon the first day of the week, the DISCIPLES came together to break bread." We see, in these instances, that the breaking of bread, or the supper of the Lord, was an ordinance appointed for the professed *disciples of Jesus*. Others were admitted to the public worship of christians. Their presence was even desired and sought. But when the disciples assembled around the table of the Lord, they assembled alone, or if others were present, they were not expected to participate in the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

In confirmation of this conclusion, it may be observed, in the 4th place, that none but *real saints* —such as those only who are con-

nected with the church have professed themselves to be—*can come*, without hypocrisy, to the table of the Lord.—Impenitent sinners attend upon a preached gospel. Indeed the preaching of the gospel often *supposes* their attendance. It addresses them *as sinners*, exposing their guilt, warning them of danger, and calling upon them to flee from the wrath to come. It is to them an appointed mean of conversion and salvation.—But, knowing and professing themselves to be impenitent, they cannot, without palpable hypocrisy, present themselves at the table of the Lord. This ordinance has a meaning—it utters a language; and its language is such, that none but those who regard and profess themselves to be saints, can consistently adopt it. "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?" All who partake of the Lord's supper hereby manifest their communion with the Saviour. But impenitent sinners have no communion with him; and they cannot perform an act which manifests such communion, unless they do it hypocritically.—In the supper of the Lord, we have an emblem of the broken body and shed blood of Christ—a symbolical representation of his *death*. And those who partake of the ordinance hereby virtually confess, that they deserve to *die* for their sins, and that their only hope of being saved from death is founded on the atoning blood of their Saviour. In feeding upon the emblems of Christ's body and blood, they also signify their *union* to him—that they feed on him by a living faith—and affectionately trust in him for pardon and salvation. As much as this, every communicant virtually *says*, whenever he approaches the table of the Lord. But can the impenitent sinner consistently perform an act, which utters a language such as this? Can he truly say, by any act of his, that he deserves to die for his sins—that his only hope is in the blood of Christ—that he loves the Saviour—feeds upon him by faith—and affectionately trusts in him for pardon and salvation? While, indeed, he is a sinner, he certainly does not feel this, and he cannot say it. And he cannot perform an act which amounts to saying it, without hypocrisy. Consequently he cannot present himself for communion at the table of the Lord.

In reply to those who would degrade the sacrament of the supper, by placing it on a level with the ordinary means of grace, I may observe again, 5thly, that the scriptures attach a *peculiar solemnity* to this ordinance, and insist upon the importance of special *preparation*, previously to receiving it. "This cup," said the Saviour, when administering it for the first time—"This cup is the New Testament," or *covenant*, "in my blood." The meaning is, "This cup, this sacrament, is a *seal* of the new covenant in my blood." It is an instituted *seal* of the covenant of grace, by which those who receive it solemnly bind themselves to perform the conditions of the covenant, and by which the Deity binds himself to fulfil to them its gracious promises. Is not then the ordinance of the supper—the seal of the new covenant in the blood of Christ—of a *peculiarly solemn* character? In point of sacredness and solemnity, what rite or service of our holy religion can compare with this?—Accordingly, special *preparation* is enjoined in the Scriptures, in

order to a proper reception of this ordinance. "Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."—And the *consequences* of receiving it unworthily, are represented as deplorable. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*." And again, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh *damnation* [*judgment*] *to himself*, not discerning the Lord's body."—The ordinance of the Lord's supper is usually regarded by pious persons as possessing peculiar sacredness and solemnity; and in these views respecting it there is no superstition. It *is* a peculiarly solemn service—perhaps I do well to say the most solemn act of our holy religion. And those who would bring it down to a level with the ordinary means of grace, and who regard all, that attend public worship, as thereby qualified and entitled to receive it, are chargeable with divesting it of its peculiar character, and actually degrading it.

The motives of such persons may be, to bring the sacrament into more *common use*; and to induce *greater numbers* in their congregations to receive it. But what advantage can it be for persons to receive it, unless by true piety, and a sincere profession of religion, they are prepared to receive it in a proper manner? What advantage can it be to receive it unworthily, and so become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?—And besides, it is very much to be doubted, whether, by degrading the sacrament of the supper to a level with the ordinary means of grace, *greater numbers would be induced to receive it.* The probability rather is, that in this way, it would fall into neglect and contempt. Divested of its peculiarly solemn character, it would soon be regarded as little more than an idle ceremony, and would perhaps be discontinued.

The *world*, if admitted to the Lord's table, would feel no interest in it. The temper of their minds would ill accord with those humbling, melting, and yet joyful sensations, which the sacrament is fitted to produce. And the people of God, by being associated in this service with those whom they could not embrace as christian brethren and sisters, and with whom they could hold no spiritual communion, would find the scene divested of half its endearments; while reflections would necessarily be obtruded upon them to taint and embitter the other half.

How much better, that this holy ordinance remain, as the Saviour left it? He instituted it for the special benefit of his *disciples*. He left it a precious legacy to his *friends*. These, he welcomes to his board. With these, he delightfully communes. But to those, who venture to approach his table, either in open impenitence, or disguised hypocrisy, he may be regarded as saying, "*Who hath required this at your hands? How came ye in hither, not having on the wedding garment?*"

The remarks here made are perfectly consistent with *another*, with which this discussion shall be concluded;—It is the *duty of all persons under the gospel*, who have arrived to years of understanding and reflection, to *commemorate the dying love of Christ at his table.* All should be encouraged to approach this ordinance, not impenitently, not with sinful, unrenewed hearts, but in such a temper and manner, as Christ has required, and will approve. None should be excluded, except those,

who, by their sinful tempers and characters, exclude themselves. All, who hear the gospel, should be made to feel their indispensable obligations, to exercise and profess the religion of Christ; that so they may be prepared for the communion of saints on earth, and for everlasting consolations in the heavenly state. P.

For the Christian Magazine.

THOUGHTS ON PRAYER.

It appears from the word and character of God, that if sinners would offer up proper desires to him, he would always hear their prayers and grant their requests. No selfish desires are proper desires, and ought never to be offered to God in prayer, because his holy and benevolent heart must disapprove and condemn them. But the righteous Lord loves righteous and holy desires. "The prayers of the upright are his delight." "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." God says, "to this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." Sinners can have no objections against praying as God requires, but what arise entirely from the depravity of their hearts. They say, that they have not such good desires as God requires, and therefore they ought not to be exhorted to offer up such good desires in their prayers. God knows that all their desires are selfish and sinful; but nevertheless, he requireth them to pray with good desires, and forbids them to pray with any other. What shall ministers do in this case? Shall they in pity and condescension to sinners, exhort them to offer up such selfish and sinful desires as they have to God in their prayers? Or shall they exhort them to offer up only such good desires as God requires them to have and to express in praying to him? What is best and safest for ministers to preach? and what is safest and best for them to hear? This is an appeal to their reason and conscience. God will hear and accept their prayers, if they offer up good desires, but will condemn and reject them, if they offer up sinful desires. Now, if their conscience be awake, they will say to the preacher as Elias said to Samuel. "Eli called to Samuel, and he answered here am I. And he said, what is the thing that the Lord hath said unto thee? I pray thee hide it not from me: God do so to thee, and more also, if thou hide any thing from me of all the things that he said unto thee." But here sinners are ready to say, "that it is the duty of ministers to preach the truth on this subject, and it is our duty to hear the truth, but we cannot do our duty, and ministers know it, and for this reason, some direct us to do something else instead of our duty, and this we like, and we wonder all ministers cannot be so kind as to preach in the same pleasing manner. We have no objection against their telling us, that it is our duty to pray, and to pray as God requires; if they will afterwards tell us, that since we cannot pray aright, we ought to pray as well as we can with a wicked heart, and that this is the way to get a good heart. This is all the encouragement we want, or at least, all the encouragement we can expect ministers to give us; though it is true, we find we are still apt to faint in pursuing this course, because we have never yet found our prayers answered. Accordingly after we

have begun to pray we have often fainted and at times neglected it, till we finally resolved to neglect it entirely, and wait till God shall enable us to pray better. And though we have read and heard, that it is better to pray wrong than not to pray at all, yet we very much doubt whether this be so, and in such a doubtful case, we choose to neglect a disagreeable duty." Is not this a just representation of the views, and feelings, and conduct of many individual persons, and some that stand in the serious and important relation of heads of families? They do not always pray, but sometimes faint, and become altogether discouraged. Now, let me ask, what is the most likely way to induce such persons to persevere in their neglected duty, to tell them, as Christ does, that they ought always to pray and to pray aright, and not to faint; or to tell them they had better pray wrong and continue to pray wrong, though they have no reason to expect God will hear and answer their prayers? This is a plain and intelligible question, that a youth, if not a child, may answer. The design of this paper is, to persuade prayerless persons to pray; and what is most likely to produce this effect? to illustrate, or to contradict, the plain declaration of Christ, "that men ought *always* to pray, and not to faint." There can be no solid objection against following Christ's direction, and it is dangerous in the highest degree to give any other.

DANIEL.

For the Christian Magazine.

ON MODERN CHARITY.

WHEN I hear a person insisting much on the necessity of mutual *charity*, in the modern sense of the term, which is little better than a mutual *indifference* towards one another's errors and faults, I take it for granted that his character labors, and that he is sensible he *needs* a large share of this charity to be exercised towards himself. When I was settled over the people with whom I now labor, there was in the Church, a brother of respectable standing, rather forward and talkative than otherwise, who was frequently insisting upon the importance of mutual forbearance and charity, and of judging as favorably of one another as possible. After hearing this sort of discourse from him, at intervals, for some considerable time, I was led to suspect that there might be a cause for it; and on close and careful inquiry, I discovered, to my satisfaction, that he was privately living in the practice of intemperance. The secret of his charity now came out, and we were able to estimate his exhortations to mutual forbearance, as they deserved.

There is a denomination of Christians in this country, who are noted for their zeal in the cause of *charity*. They are constantly insisting, especially when in the hearing of other denominations, on the importance of mutual forbearance, and of judging as favorably of one another as we can. They are even violent, sometimes, for moderation, and can hardly think charitably of any one, whose views of charity do not coincide with their own. Will not the story above related help to account for their conduct? Do they not know and feel, that they *need* great allowances to be made for them, especially in regard to their religious principles? Do they not know, that they have

swerved very far from the religion of their puritan ancestors; and very far from that which, in the judgment of nine-tenths of protestant Christendom, lies on the very face of the Scriptures? Are they not conscious of having but a questionable claim even to the *name* of Christian; and that, unless great allowances are made for them, they must, ere long, be disowned by the Christian world? And is not this the true reason why they are insisting so frequently and strenuously on the mutual exercise of something, which they misname *charity?*—"*I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say.*" W.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER IX.

In my former fragment I left the Pilgrims *Thoughtful* and *Ardent* at the new house, a little out of the way, on the left hand, dissatisfied with their entertainment there, and consulting the King's book for guidance and direction.

So I saw in my dream, that having no disposition to sleep, they spent the night in reading their book, and conversing together, and in crying to their Lord and King to forgive them for having listened to these deceivers, and turned aside out of the path, and in beseeching him to grant them deliverance. And as soon as it was light, they left their chamber, descended to the hall, and rushed out of the house, giving no heed to the porter who called after them to tarry till his mistresses arose.

Now when they had gained the highway, they kneeled down, and gave thanks to the king for their deliverance, and then went forward with a quick pace. And soon they came in sight of a venerable edifice, directly by the road side, on the right hand, on the summit of the hill. On drawing nearer, they saw the lions; but remembering that those who kept in the middle of the path were out of their reach, they passed them without much fear, and coming up to the gate, they inquired of *Watchful*, the porter, whether this was the house Beautiful, at which the pilgrim *Christian* had been entertained.

Watchful. It is the same. It is built of living stones; and, though it has now stood many ages, it is not in the least decayed, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. And it will stand till the dissolution of the world, when the materials of which it is built will be transported to the celestial city, and form a part of that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

Pilgrims. May we be received into this house?

Watchful. If you can furnish satisfactory evidence that you are the true friends of the Lord of this house, you may be received into it, and enjoy its privileges. It was built for the accommodation of pilgrims; but as many, in these days, put on the pilgrim's dress, and walk for a time in the pilgrim's path, who do not prove true at last, we feel it our duty to examine all applicants for admission as closely as we can, according to the rules which were established by Him who built the house.

So he inquired who they were, and whence they came, and whether they came into the way at

the wicket gate, and had been at the house of the Interpreter, and they told him. Then he rang the bell, and the damsel, *Discretion*, came out, and having made similar inquiries, and received the answers of the pilgrims, she called out the mistresses of the mansion themselves, *Piety*, *Prudence*, and *Charity*, who discoursed with them in many words, and heard an account of what they had met with by the way, and what they had seen at the house of the Interpreter. They also questioned them respecting their knowledge and approbation of what is contained in the statute book of the King, and what views they had of his character, and why they felt desirous of going to the celestial city. They also inquired into their knowledge and practice of the rules which are to be observed by pilgrims in the way. So when they had received the answers of the pilgrims, and had conferred with each other, they told them that the account they had given of themselves was so far satisfactory, that according to the rules of the house, they were to be received to its privileges; and desired them to walk in. But they informed the pilgrims also, that, notwithstanding all the caution they could use, some had been received there who had not proved true at last. To your own master, said they, you must stand or fall. If you come in and partake of the privileges of this house, which are provided for true pilgrims only, and prove false in the end, the peril is your own.

Then I observed that the pilgrims entered the house both rejoicing and trembling. And when they were seated, the servant was desired to give to each a couple of figs and a cluster of raisins, for their present refreshment, till the stated meal should be prepared.

So Piety, Prudence and Charity sat down to converse with the pilgrims; and thus they began.

Piety. You have great occasion to be thankful to the Lord of the way, that he has brought you thus far on your journey. It is to be ascribed to his kind care of you, that you have not been drawn aside, and ruined forever.

Ardent. We have, indeed, great occasion for thankfulness: but I, most of all; for I have been on the point of destroying myself, by my rash and foolish conduct, more than once. Had not my brother Thoughtful been more considerate than I, Mr. Plausible would have persuaded us to exchange our copies of the King's statute book, for some of his altered ones. And it was chiefly owing to my rashness that we were decoyed into the pretended house Beautiful, on the left hand, where we spent the last night.

Piety. Two are better than one. It is a great favor to a pilgrim to be furnished by the Lord of the way with a faithful companion. But had you not been told to beware of the arts of the three sisters, *Hypocrisy*, *Carnal Policy*, and *Heresy?*

Ardent. We had been. But I little thought such fine spoken people had been they.

Piety. If you had consulted your book, you would have found a caution against those who "by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." You would have been taught also, to be on your guard against such as are forward to "proclaim every one his own goodness." You ought never to take any important step without humbly asking direction of the King, and carefully seeking that direction from his book. It

is a sure and safe guide to every humble and teachable inquirer.

Ardent. I have always found it so, when I have sought its counsel in that manner. But I was in such haste to find a place of entertainment, that I was not willing to take time for consideration or inquiry. My brother Thoughtful would have made inquiry, but I hurried him along against his better judgment.

Thoughtful. I consider my guilt the greater. If the King has given me a natural temperament more cautious than that of others, it is a greater crime in me to listen to a deceiver, and to turn aside out of the path, as I did last night, to my grief and shame.

Piety. You ought to humble yourselves for every departure from the right path, because you thus dishonor the Lord of the way, as well as bring guilt on your own souls. It is a great dishonor to the Lord of pilgrims, when his true friends turn out of the way. You can never humble yourselves too low before him on account of your sins against him. For therein consists the great evil of sin, that it is committed against your Lord and King. Your last night's adventure, however, may be an occasion of good to you, if you are disposed to make a right improvement of it. "We know that all things work together for good, to them that love the Lord of the way." This adventure ought to teach you to ponder the path of your feet, and to give more earnest heed to the things contained in the King's book.

Ardent. I trust it will. But I wonder that the Lord of the way, since he knows how liable pilgrims are to be deceived, does not drive all his enemies from the pilgrim's path, that they may go on their way unmolested.

Piety. The Lord of the way does all things wisely and well. He knows it is best, that through much tribulation pilgrims should enter the celestial city. He has left many Canaanites in the land, to prove pilgrims by them, to know whether they will hearken unto the commandments of their King, and steadfastly walk in his ways.

Ardent. Would it not be better if the enemies of pilgrims were all openly such? They would not lead so many astray, if they did not put on so many specious disguises, profess to have so many good feelings, and use so many good words.

Piety. Our Lord knows what is best, and he is both able and inclined to do what is best. He doubtless has good designs to accomplish by all these things. If we do not know what they are now, we may know hereafter. It is written, "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." If the enemies of pilgrims did not sometimes put on the guise of friends, profess to have many good feelings, and use many good words, the trial of the pilgrim's fidelity could not be so decisive.

Thoughtful. I should like to hear pointed out some of the principal advantages which the true pilgrim may derive from meeting with so many, who are not the true friends of the Lord of the way.

Piety. One great advantage is, that it shows them more of their own hearts, and thus promotes their humility. When they see others do wickedly, they may see what they would have done if divine grace had not made them to differ. When others solicit them to go out of the way, and they comply, or feel any disposition to

comply, they may see how treacherous and deceitful their own hearts are, and how foolish it is to trust in themselves.—Another advantage is, that it affords them an opportunity for the exertion of every christian grace. The excellent character of the Prince Immanuel himself could not have been seen, if he had not been surrounded with enemies, who gave him an opportunity to act out and exemplify, for the imitation of his followers, every holy affection.—When others treat us unkindly, it gives us an opportunity to exercise meekness, forbearance, gentleness, forgiveness, and kindness towards them, and submission to the will of our Lord and King, and confidence in him, and a patient waiting for him.

Another advantage is, that it teaches them where to put their trust. By being beset with enemies, from which no wisdom or strength of their own could deliver them, they may learn to look to Him who is able to deliver, and to feel their obligation to him when he does deliver. Another advantage is, that it teaches them to be more watchful. In proportion to the numbers, power and subtlety of our enemies and our danger of falling a prey to them, is the need of watchfulness. It also makes them more active and diligent, and prompts to greater efforts in the cause of their Lord. We are naturally so slothful, that they seldom make any great efforts till they are driven to it by necessity, and their dormant powers are roused by a sense of danger. The noblest feats, which were ever achieved by any of the servants of the King, were those which were performed in times of imminent danger from enemies. Another advantage which pilgrims derive from enemies, is, that it helps them in the important work of self-examination. Enemies will often tell them of those faults which the mistaken kindness or the ill judged partiality of friends conceal. Another advantage is, that it makes them more prayerful. *Christian* met with some enemies in the valley of the Shadow of Death, who did not regard the point of his sword, and against whom he could defend himself with no other weapon than *all prayer*. Another advantage is, that it leads them to a more careful study of the King's statute-book. Many neglect this, to their great disadvantage, till they are driven to it for direction, and help, and comfort, by the attacks of their enemies. But in this, every help is provided of which pilgrims stand in need, and directions given how to escape every danger and surmount every difficulty. Another advantage is, that it weans them more and more from this world, by convincing them most effectually, that pilgrims can have here no continuing city, but must fight, and struggle, and press on to the celestial gate. And in these ways, the enemies of pilgrims, by their efforts, greatly promote their growth in grace, and their preparation for their heavenly inheritance, which will thus be rendered more acceptable and valuable to them.

Ardent. I am satisfied that the King does wisely and well in so ordering it that the pilgrim's path is beset with enemies. I think I shall never more be disposed to call in question his goodness in this.

Thoughtful. This shows clearly, why it is so ordered that these enemies should so frequently come in the guise of friends, should sometimes seem to walk in the

same path, and be admitted with pilgrims to the same house. A hypocrite can render many services to the true pilgrim, which an open enemy could not.

Piety. It shows also that pilgrims have no reason to be discouraged when their enemies become numerous and powerful. The enemies of pilgrims have no more power and influence than what seems good in the sight of the King. And pilgrims may be certain that their Lord and King would not give so much power and influence to his and their enemies, unless it was to accomplish some great and good purpose by it. When they arrive at the celestial city, they will doubtless see how all things have worked together for the glory of their King, and the best good of those that love him. And their enemies themselves will see that all their efforts have only conspired to promote that cause, which they so zealously labored to destroy; and that the King employed them thus, because he saw that they could not be employed in any other way so much to the advancement of his glory.

Thoughtful. I thank you for these remarks. I feel myself greatly encouraged by them to persevere without weariness and without fainting in the pilgrim's path.

Piety. You will have need of all the encouragement which an habitual sense of the wisdom, power, and goodness of your King can afford: for the way is beset with dangers through all its course. But, blessed is he that shall endure unto the end.

Then I perceived that the company united in singing the following hymn:

"Awake our souls, away our fears,
Let every trembling thought be gone;
Awake and run the heavenly road,
And put a cheerful courage on.

True, 'tis a strait and thorny road,
And mortal spirits tire and faint,
But they forget the mighty God
That feeds the strength of every saint.

From thee, the overflowing spring,
Our souls shall drink a fresh supply;
While such as trust their native strength
Shall melt away, and droop and die.

Swift as an eagle cuts the air,
We'll mount aloft to thine abode;
On wings of love our souls shall fly,
Nor tire amidst the heavenly road."

By this time the table was spread, and after one had craved a blessing of the bountiful Giver of all good upon themselves and their refreshments, they sat down to a plain but wholesome repast. I observed, however, that although there were no elegancies or superfluities, yet there was an abundant supply of solid and nutritious food, of which the pilgrims partook, I thought, with the more lively relish, from their having fared so poorly the night before. So, after they had refreshed themselves, and one had given thanks, they set down, and resumed their discourse.

BUNYANUS.

From the Recorder and Telegraph.

NOTES OF THANKS, &C.

ON a subject of such constant recurrence as public requests for prayers, and acknowledgements of favors, it is desirable that there should be propriety in selecting the occasions and in the forms of the notes. But as both are often to be determined, in the first instance, by those poorly qualified for even this task, it seems right that clergymen should exercise a correctional supervision. Yet from some pulpits, petitions for the sick are always, "That God would bless the means used for their recovery, *or* fit and prepare them for his holy will and pleasure."

Not to speak of the repeated tautology of the last part of the sentence, the request is, that the sick person may recover; but if he *must die*, that he may become a Christian. The long practised absurdity of asking "*for*" the death of friends, has to a considerable extent been discovered and laid aside. To request the prayers of the church and *congregation*, appears of doubtful propriety; but to request the prayers of the congregation, without reference to the church, is a course which can accomplish but little. To ask prayers for one's self or friend "going a journey," or to give public thanks on the return, seems to be taking special cases too much from the ordinary affairs of life. Even if the occasion is a voyage to sea, the objection holds good. Every family has dangers to encounter and deliverances to acknowledge, and from time to time occasions occur of more than ordinary interest. But if all these are to be selected and sent up for public notice, the whole time of the assembly will be occupied about private concerns. Sometimes these public notes are so multiplied by families, as to excite the thought that possibly there may be mingled with their pious feelings, a half-formed willingness to relieve themselves from part of their obligations to domestic prayer and praise, by obtaining the assistance of the public.

Death and dangerous sickness are cases unlike all others in interest, and they lead the mind directly to eternity. There is therefore a peculiar fitness in bringing these publicly before God. There are a few other circumstances of very special danger or extraordinary deliverance, which admit of the same notice. But let ordinary occurrences be made the occasions of deep personal and domestic humiliation, and gratitude; a stronger feeling at home, in proportion as there is less exhibition abroad.

There is one other topic which I approach with feelings of delicacy, and with some hesitation. It is a custom which prevails in many places to return thanks at the births of children.—These are events which indeed call upon the parents to bless God in secret and unitedly. But they, of all occasions, belong to the delicacy of conjugal and domestic confidence. If they are to be followed by public thanksgiving, why should they not be preceded by public supplication? If our feelings would shrink from the latter, they would equally from the former, but for the effect of custom. The inuendo form of "mercies received," is peculiarly objectionable.

I have noticed but a part of the topics connected with the subject. If what I have written, shall correct any of the mistakes which have excited a smile when only the deepest solemnity should have found a place, I shall have done some good. H.

REASONING EMPLOYED BY CELSUS AGAINST CHRISTIANS OF HIS DAY.

This author wrote about the close of the second century, and a more virulent enemy of christianity never existed. A few extracts from his writings will serve to satisfy the attentive reader, that there is little new in the calumnies which have been employed, and in the spirit which has been manifested, by some modern divines, and some modern reviewers, in conducting their attacks upon their clerical brethren, whose ministerial zeal appears to them

to the tomb of the infidel; but I love strong and striking contrasts, especially when looking back upon the *despised* and the *caressed* of their several days; and when, viewing them at this distance, through a medium obscured neither by prejudice nor passion, we can see the distinguished pre-eminence which the men of God have gained, over the polished, and captivating, and philosophic infidel. For I do verily believe there is not a man of reflection, at present, whether he be vicious or virtuous, who would not rather say with Balaam, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his," than to enjoy all the learning and the bad pre-eminence of a Hume, and then go into eternity unjustified and unsanctified—for "Wo unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him." The tomb of the materialist, is a plain circular marble mausoleum, inscribed simply, but I think elegantly, with the words, David Hume. I was told that a little before my visit to Edinburgh, one of the students wrote upon it the following impromptu—

"Beneath this circular *idea*,
Vulgarly called tomb,
Impressions and *ideas* rest
Which constituted Hume."

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

UNITARIANISM SOUND DOCTRINE.—*A Sermon preached in Waltham, at the Ordination of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, Feb.* 15, 1826. *By Nathaniel Whitman, Minister of Billerica.*

IT is not on account of any peculiar ability displayed in this sermon, or of its superior merits in any other respects, that we are disposed to bring it before the public. Had it been preached in almost any other circumstances, it might with propriety have been left, like many other publications of equal, even superior worth, to repose in quietness upon the shelves of the author's friends. But the peculiar circumstances which led to the ordination of Mr. Whitman in Waltham, and consequently to the delivery of this sermon, seem to require particular attention to what was said on the occasion. With some of these circumstances, it is proper that our readers should be made acquainted.

In January, 1821, Rev. Sewall Harding, who had previously preached in Waltham for nearly a year, and who had been instrumental of collecting and forming the second church in that place, was solemnly consecrated to the work of the ministry among them. After his ordination, he continued to labor with great diligence, fidelity and success, among "the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer." To his people in general, as well as to others, to whom he occasionally spake the word, his preaching was very acceptable. And as a man, as a scholar, and a christian, he was, it is believed, universally respected by those who knew him. His usefulness among his people was often acknowledged, not only by his particular friends, but by those who were the most averse to his religious sentiments, and the least influenced by private attachment. There was, however, in his society, as there is in most others in that vicinity,

an Unitarian influence. A few individuals were from the first opposed to Mr. Harding's religious sentiments. These, although with the fairest opportunity to know his ministerial character, they had been actively engaged in his settlement, became at length desirous of his dismission. And taking an advantage of the time, when a large proportion of the males had recently removed from the manufacturing establishment in that place, and an addition of between thirty and forty new members suddenly made to the society, they succeeded in obtaining a vote for his dismission. As Mr. Harding was settled upon the condition, that he should be dismissed from the society when two thirds of the voters, at a legal meeting, should signify that this was their desire, it was at once seen, that a dissolution of his connexion with that people was inevitable, if his opposers persevered in their efforts to remove him. As, however, it was well known that the church were all peculiarly desirous of his continuance, and affected even to tears at the prospect of his removal; and as it was also well known, that much the greater part of the congregation, who attended upon his preaching, were as much attached to him as ever; a faint hope was cherished, that some arrangements would be made for his continuance among them. But this hope was disappointed. Although it was the general sentiment of the people in that place, as well as the neighbouring towns, that Mr. Harding was an able, a faithful, and a judicious minister; although the agent of the manufacturing establishment gave his decided testimony to the fidelity and usefulness of Mr. Harding as a minister of the gospel; although but sixty two voted for his dismission, and more than three hundred, including females, petitioned for his continuance; although the society, at the very meeting at which they acted respecting his dismission, acknowledged the diligence and fidelity with which he had discharged the duties of his office, and declared, in a certificate which they tendered him, that the only ground of their dissatisfaction was an honest difference of sentiment; yet they persisted in their efforts to procure his dismission. At the expiration of the time, when according to the terms of his settlement, Mr. Harding's engagements with the society were fulfilled, an Ecclesiastical Council was called to sanction his dismission. This Council, as they were obliged to do, by the terms of the contract, dismissed him from the society. But on account of the peculiar attachment of the Church to him, and their earnest desire that his pastoral connexion with them might not be dissolved, the Council dismissed him from the society only. Provision was immediately made by the Church, and a respectable portion of the Society, for the continuance of his support, and a place provided for public worship. Mr. Harding, feeling himself perplexed in regard to the question of duty in his peculiar circumstances, and the Church uncertain what was the most judicious course to be pursued, united in calling a Council for advice. A Council was accordingly convened, which sympathized with the Church under their trials, commended them for the stand, which they had taken, and advised them to take measures to procure a more permanent place for public worship. They also advised Mr. Harding to con-

tinue to officiate, as their pastor and teacher. In the mean time, the society employed Mr. Bernard Whitman to preach in the meeting-house, who, it appears, was invited to settle with them, and on the day mentioned in the title page of the Sermon before us, was ordained as their minister. His brother, of Billerica, preached the Sermon. As might have been expected by all who were acquainted with the circumstances of Mr. Harding's dismission, and the introduction of Mr. Whitman to his place, an interest was felt, and an effort made, on this occasion, to support and recommend Unitarianism. We do not wonder that its advocates thought it necessary to say something, on this occasion, in its defence. They could not but be convinced, that this system of religion, as it had been exemplified in recent transactions in that place, needed at least an apology. We doubt not there were many, at this time in Waltham, who, knowing nothing of Unitarianism but by its fruits, were in great danger of forming the conclusion, that it was both inconsistent with the word of God, and pernicious in its effects upon society. If the author sincerely believes, as he professes to do, that it is "sound doctrine," and that its consequences are as salutary as he pretends, we see not how he could have discharged his duty, either to God, or his fellow-creatures, without an effort to defend it. In supposing that this was a proper time, and a proper place to prove the "Divinity of Unitarianism," if such a thing is practicable, the author has certainly evinced a sound judgment.

There was a time when Unitarians, in this country, thought it proper to keep their peculiarities in a great measure concealed, and unwise to attempt a public vindication of them. Dr. Freeman, in one of his letters on the state of Unitarianism in this country, says, "I am acquainted with a number of ministers, particularly in the southern part of this state, who avow and publicly preach this sentiment. There are others more cautious, who content themselves with leading their hearers, by a course of rational and prudent sermons, gradually and insensibly to embrace it. Though this latter mode is not what I entirely approve, yet it produces good effects. For the people are thus kept out of the reach of false opinions, and are prepared for the impressions which will be made on them by more bold and ardent successors, who will probably be raised up when these timid characters are removed off the stage." Whether the author of the sermon before us, has generally pursued the course of these "timid characters," among his own people or not, we have no means of ascertaining. From the charge of timidity, he is certainly clear, in this instance. And we doubt not, that the most timid of the sect would have thought it wise, in the circumstances in which he was placed, to exert themselves to the utmost to vindicate their cause.

But it is our design to notice more particularly the sermon delivered on this occasion. The author selected his text from Titus ii. 1. "*But speak thou the things that become sound doctrine.*" We shall not attempt to give our readers a full analysis of this singular production, or to answer every thing in it, which we think objectionable. Our object is to expose the sophistry, and the falsehood of the writer, by a few general remarks. The first,

which we deem it important to make, and the only one with which we shall trouble our readers in this number, is this: *There is a strange indefiniteness in the author's statements, which is calculated to blind and mislead his hearers.* In attempting to define his own system and that of his opponents, he says no more of one, than what is true of the other. In the very beginning of his discourse, with scarcely the ceremony which decorum obviously required, he thus expresses himself: "Until within a short period, the instruction, dispensed from this sacred desk, has been in accordance with that theological system, which claims, as exclusively its own, the character of sound doctrine. Henceforth instruction is to be statedly dispensed from this place in accordance with that system which its opposers seem to think themselves justified in reprobating as another gospel." Although this remark is nothing to our present purpose, and may perhaps be considered by our readers as entirely out of place; yet we cannot refrain from expressing our surprise, that a man of Mr. Whitman's delicacy of feeling, should so unceremoniously, and so unnecessarily, not to say so rudely, allude to the instruction which had been given in that place. As he had never heard it himself, it might have appeared modest in him not to have hastened to give it a character. Nor are we less surprised, that he should immediately follow this allusion, with a bold and confident assertion, that "the instruction which is henceforth to be given in this place," is to be of another character. It certainly was not necessary, that he should here turn prophet, and absolutely predict that no alteration would in future take place in regard to the instruction there given. His audience, who had recently witnessed so sudden and unexpected a change in that place, might surely have been left to think, that another change was among the possibilities of the age. But this is among the little things in the sermon, which perhaps might as well have been left unnoticed. We have quoted the above passage, for the purpose of showing the indefiniteness of the preacher's language, and the false impressions which this indefiniteness was calculated, if not designed, to make upon his audience. In giving "the character of the instruction which had been dispensed in that place," he says that "it has been in accordance with that theological system which claims, as exclusively its own, the character of sound doctrine." The only characteristic by which he here distinguishes the theological system of Trinitarians, from that of Unitarians is, the former claims, as exclusively its own, the character of sound doctrine. Now if he means by this, that Trinitarians believe that no other system is sound, in those respects in which it differs from theirs, his assertion is doubtless true. But this is saying no more of the theological system of Trinitarians, than is true of that of Unitarians, or of any other. Whoever sincerely believes that he is right, must of course as sincerely believe that all, who differ from him, are, in those respects in which they differ from him, wrong. But if he means that Trinitarians believe that none who differ from them are right in any respect, his assertion is totally false; because if they believe their own system to be right, they must of course believe that

all are right in those respects in which they agree with them. It is not a little singular, that the author should mention, as the leading feature of the system of his opponents, the very thing, which it is the object of his sermon to prove is true of his own. The avowed object of his sermon is to prove that Unitarianism is "sound doctrine." And by this he means, if he means any thing to his purpose, that it is exclusively sound doctrine. We cannot suppose him guilty of so egregious a blunder, as designedly to intimate, that any thing opposed to sound doctrine, is sound doctrine. The most simple hearer, that listened to this discourse, was doubtless capable of seeing, that if Unitarianism is true, all other systems must be false, in those respects in which they differ from it. It is then as true of Unitarianism, as it is of Trinitarianism, "that it claims, as exclusively its own, the character of sound doctrine." But we should not have noticed this want of logical accuracy, in the sermon, were there not an appearance of design in the use of this language. It is well known that Trinitarians are reproached for believing that they are right, and others wrong. The system is frequently and reproachfully termed, "the exclusive system." Mr. W. therefore, by saying that "the instruction which had been dispensed from that sacred desk, was in accordance with that theological system which claims, as exclusively its own, the character of sound doctrine," could, not only conveniently designate it as the instruction of a Trinitarian, but at the same time, brand it with reproach. We will not say that this was his object, in using this language. But, when we consider how easy it was for him to have used terms, which would have expressed his meaning much more concisely, much more respectfully, and much more logically, we find it difficult to suppress the fear, that he intended a sly reflection upon his opponents. It must be a great mistake, in a minister of the gospel, to use the language of reproach, in giving the character of an opponent's belief or instruction. There is an unmanliness in this thing, which is not only inconsistent with the character of any fair and honorable disputant, but beneath the dignity of the christian minister.

Mr. W. is no less indefinite in the description which he gives of the system of instruction, which he supposes is to be given in that place, than in his description of that which had been given. The only thing, which he mentions as distinguishing this from the other, is the fact, that "its opposers think themselves justified in reprobating it as another gospel." But how does this fact distinguish Unitarianism from Trinitarianism? Do not the opposers of Trinitarianism reprobate this as another gospel? How much less than this does our author himself do, in the following sentence. "The doctrine of the Trinity we cannot but conscienciously oppose as subversive of that fundamental doctrine of revelation, the exclusively supreme Deity of our heavenly Father." Again he says, "The hypothesis of two natures in Christ, shakes to the foundation the whole christian fabric.—I therefore repeat it, the hypothesis of two natures in Christ, which constitutes the chief corner stone of the Trinitarian temple, shakes to its centre the whole christian fabric." Now can any one believe, that a system, "which is subversive of the fundamental

doctrine of revelation, the supreme Deity of the Father, and which shakes to its centre the whole christian fabric," is the true gospel of Jesus Christ? It is impossible. The least which this language implies is, that this system is "another gospel." Why then does Mr. Whitman attempt to designate the Unitarian system by saying it is "that system which its opposers think themselves justified in reprobating as another gospel," when almost with the same breath, he himself says substantially the same thing with respect to Trinitarianism? Is it possible that he should be so unacquainted with logic as not to know, that a definition, which answers equally well to two things specifically different, is a definition of neither of them? This we cannot suppose. But he doubtless knew, that Trinitarians are often reproached for their supposed uncharitableness, especially for their avowed belief, that Unitarianism "is another gospel." By using such language as the above, therefore, although it really makes no distinction between Unitarians and Trinitarians, he could sufficiently designate the system of the former, and at the same time load the latter with obloquy. That he designed to do this, we dare not say. But our readers will doubtless agree with us, that his manner of treating the subject strongly indicates it.

There is an indefiniteness, calculated to deceive, in Mr. W's use of the term Unitarianism. This may mean the belief that the Father only is God; or it may mean that system of doctrines which Unitarians actually *do* believe, in opposition to those which are received by Trinitarians. Now Mr. Whitman uses this term in the beginning of his discourse, as though he meant by it the actual difference, which there is in the theological views of the two parties. But when he comes to produce his proof of "the divinity of Unitarianism," he appears to mean by this, simply the belief that the Father only is God. And he discusses the subject throughout, as though the settling of this point, settled the controversy between the contending parties. In the beginning of his discourse, Mr. W. alludes to Unitarianism, and speaks of it as the gospel itself. He speaks of "that theological *system*," in accordance with which instruction had been given in that sacred desk, and "of that *system*," in accordance with which, instruction is to be given in that place in future. By the first, he is understood to mean, the religious opinions of a Trinitarian, and by the other, the religious opinions of a Unitarian. He speaks of the controversy between Trinitarians and Unitarians, in that general way, which clearly indicates that he intended the whole subject of difference between them. He says, "the time is arrived when the people at large should be given thoroughly to understand this great warfare among the clergy," and declares "that it has become their solemn duty to state explicitly to the people its precise object and character." He then gives notice that he has chosen this controversy as the subject of his discourse, and proposes the following plan, as the outlines of his discussion, in which our readers will perceive that he speaks of Unitarianism, not as a single contested doctrine merely, but as a "*system* of faith." "In prosecuting my design, I shall first exhibit proof of the divinity of Unitarianism; thence deduce the obligations under which the Unitarian

clergy feel themselves to be laid of preaching this *system;* and then conclude with some observations on the proper mode of preaching this *system of faith* once delivered to the saints." Now such language as this must naturally lead Mr. W's audience to expect a full developement of the principles of Unitarianism, as well as prove that this is in accordance with the scriptures. True, he very modestly professes to "leave to abler hands the discussion of the more difficult topics connected with this controversy;" but still cherishes the hope that he "should be able to present its merits within a narrow compass, in words easy to be understood, and in a manner adapted to the popular wants of the christian community." But how does he present the merits of this great controversy? Does he, as we should naturally expect, and as is obviously essential to its merits, give his audience a full view of the difference between Trinitarians and Unitarians? No. The controversy respecting the Trinity is the only subject presented before them, and this, as will be shown in a future number, in a very imperfect and sophistical manner. He gives his audience no intimation, that upon the subject of human depravity, regeneration, atonement and future punishment, Unitarians in general are at war with Trinitarians. He describes Unitarianism, and proceeds with his proof of "its divinity," as though it was simply a belief that the Father only is God, and that the truth or falsehood of this is the only important subject of controversy between the contending parties. "In describing to you the Unitarian faith, he says, page 6, we find no language so well suited to our purpose as that, in which this faith has been revealed, and in which it stands recorded in the sacred scriptures." "Father," says our Saviour in his memorable prayer, "Father, this is eternal life, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Here Mr. W. subjoins, "is a concise but complete description of Unitarianism." In page 9, he says, "Another concise but complete description of Unitarianism is to be found in the following testimony of Paul. 'We know that there is none other God but one.'" The argument derived from these passages against the Trinity, we shall not now stop to consider. We quote them only to show that he here speaks of Unitarianism, not as he appears to have done at the commencement of his discourse, as a *system*, including the doctrines generally by which Unitarians are distinguished from Trinitarians; but simply as the doctrine of one God, which he considers as inconsistent with the doctrine of the Trinity. If Mr. W. chose to confine himself to a discussion of this one point, we certainly have no right to object. Nor should we object to his representing Unitarianism as consisting in the belief that the Father only is God, if he had taken care to let his hearers know, that this is only one of many subjects on which Trinitarians and Unitarians differ. But to commence his discourse, by speaking of the controversy between them in general terms, of the *system* of the one, and the *system* of the other, as though he meant to include the whole ground of their difference, and then to treat the subject throughout, as though the only question between them is, whether there be one person or three in the Godhead, is, to say the least, a very superficial and deceptive mode of discussion.

Mr. Whitman knows perfectly well, that the controversy respecting the Trinity, is only one thing among many, which divide the clergy of New England at the present time—is only one thing among many, which divides Trinitarians and Unitarians. If then he felt it to be his duty to make the people acquainted with the precise object and character of this controversy, why did he not let his audience know what he, and the rest of his Unitarian brethren believe, on other points, in which they differ from Trinitarians generally. Or why did he not, at least, just intimate to them, that this is not the only, if it is even the principal point of difference. It might perhaps answer his purpose well to represent the Trinitarian clergy as contending with the Unitarian only because they reject the doctrine of the Trinity. But he knows, and those who heard him ought to know, that Trinitarians are not more dissatisfied with Unitarians because they reject the doctrine of the Trinity, than they are on account of their belief and conduct in many other respects. If they admitted the doctrine of the Trinity, and still persisted in the other lax principles, which the leaders of Unitarianism have avowed, their system would still be considered "as another gospel." Our author tells his audience, that he has given them a faithful description of the characteristic features of Trinitarianism and Unitarianism. But, we deem it our duty to say here, that no man, however vivid his perception, or acute his intellect, could gain from this discourse any adequate knowledge of the faith, either of Unitarians or Trinitarians. It is much better calculated to blind, than to enlighten the mind of a serious inquirer. So far from being "adapted to the popular wants of the christian community," it is directly suited to foster the prejudices of the ignorant, and to inflame the opposition of the wicked against the gospel.

We intended to illustrate more fully Mr. Whitman's indefinite and deceptive mode of treating his subject, by considering at some length, the reasons which he assigns, why Unitarians feel themselves under obligations to *preach* their system. But we have room in this number only to observe, that these reasons, so far from enforcing an obligation to preach Unitarianism, have no perceptible connexion with its peculiarities. They are general reasons which serve to enforce the obligation of ministers to preach the gospel. But so far are they from appearing to impose upon ministers an obligation to preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism, that some of them are clearly sound arguments in favour of the Trinity; and all of them, as may perhaps yet appear, might with much greater pertinency be offered to show the obligation of ministers to preach the latter, than the former.

(To be continued.)

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. AUGUST, 1826. No. 8.

THE WISDOM OF GOD IN THE PLAN OF CREATION.—A SERMON.

PSALM CIV. 24.—*O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.*

[Concluded from page 199.]

APPLICATION.

1. IF God's original and eternal plan of creation be the best possible; then it must be an all-comprehensive plan. It must extend to, and take in, all worlds, and all beings, and all objects, that ever have existed, or ever will exist. The only wise and infinitely wise God, was able to take into his plan of creation, all the creatures, and objects, and events, which he ever intended to bring into existence, in order to promote the highest good of the universe. If he had formed his plan any more, or any less extensive, it would have been a defect and imperfection in it. David supposed, that his plan of creation contained no more, nor less, than his *manifold* works, and therefore, that in wisdom he had made them all. Though the works of the Lord are "manifold," and immensely more than we can number; yet we must suppose they were all taken into his plan of creation. It is absurd to suppose, that he would, either designedly or undesignedly, overlook or omit any creature, object, or event, that could be of use to accomplish his ultimate design. Wisdom, we have observed, consists in forming the *best* plan of operations, and in devising and adopting the best means of accomplishing it. Though God was infinitely wise; yet he could not form an *infinite* plan of creation; because creation must be in its own nature limited and bounded by time and space; and it was the part of infinite wisdom to fix those bounds and limits. But all things within those boundaries, whether animate or inanimate, rational or irrational, were taken into the plan of creation, though they were vastly more numerous, than the stars of heaven and the sands on the sea shore. God saw, at one intuitive view, all things in number, weight and measure, that were necessary to carry into execution his infinitely wise plan of operation. The perfection of the plan of creation consists in its unity. Though it contains innumerable parts, they are all connected together, and constitute but *one* complete system. Be there as many worlds as there are stars in heaven; be all these worlds as full of rational and irrational creatures as this world is; it is demonstrably certain, that they are all really and inseparably connected, and all belong to

God's *one* and *original* scheme of creation. To suppose, that there is any solitary world, any solitary creature, any solitary event, or any solitary particle of matter, which is not related to, and connected with, the original and perfect plan of creation, is to call in question all the perfections of God, which were concerned in forming that plan. Every man in the world ought to beware of doubting, disbelieving, or denying the absolute perfection of God's best possible plan of creation.

2. If God's original and eternal design in creation, be the best possible one; then *he* can never see any occasion of altering and amending it for the better. Many of mankind have thought, that it needs amendments, and is capable of amendments, and have gone so far as actually to propose amendments. Mr. Hume, in his Essays on natural religion, has presumed to point out what he supposed would be real amendments. But it is very questionable, whether any amendments that men have thought of, or proposed, would really make the plan of creation any better. Nay, it is absolutely certain, that if any were made, they would mar the unity, beauty, and perfection of that infinitely wise and benevolent plan. Great and learned Divines, however, have been more bold and presumptuous on this subject, than Infidels. They have believed and taught, that God has actually seen cause to alter and amend his original and eternal purpose respecting mankind, since the apostacy. They say God originally intended, that Adam and all his posterity should have been forever holy and happy. But after Adam apostatized, he formed a new plan of redemption, through the death and mediation of Christ. They call it absurd, and next to blasphemy for any to maintain, what they term the supra-lapsarian scheme, which implies that God determined from eternity, in the plan of creation, that mankind should become sinners, and be saved through the redemption of Christ. This, all ministers maintain, who deny the doctrine of decrees, and some others of late. We charitably hope, that they do not see the ruinous consequence of their unreasonable and unscriptural opinion. It certainly implies, that God's original plan of creation was not the wisest and best; and that he has seen cause to alter and amend it in one important respect. This supposition virtually denies the perfect wisdom, rectitude, benevolence, and immutability of God; and when he is stripped of these divine attributes, he no longer appears to be a Being worthy of the supreme love, homage, trust, and confidence of any of his rational creatures. It is not a question of mere speculation, whether God's original plan of creation is the wisest and best possible, that admits of no alterations or amendments; but a question of solemn importance to decide according to truth. If we admit what has been, perhaps, sufficiently proved in this discourse, that God's original purpose, plan, and design in creation is absolutely the best possible; we must be convinced, that the opposite opinion is extremely dangerous, absurd, and criminal. It is arraigning all the perfections of the Deity to the bar of human reason, and casting a reproach upon all God has done, and can ever do, in the government of the universe. It strikes at the sole foundation of both natural and revealed religion, turns the wisdom of the gospel into

foolishness, and destroys the hope and comfort of all christians.

3. If God's original and eternal plan of creation was the wisest and best possible; then those who are displeased with him for forming it, are highly criminal and inexcusable. There is no doctrine of the gospel, perhaps, that has given so much offence to mankind in general, as the doctrine of God's eternal and immutable purpose, plan, or design, in the work of creation, which is commonly called the doctrine of decrees. They are displeased with God for forming any decrees from eternity. They are more displeased for forming his decrees concerning *them*, from eternity and before they existed. But what gives them the greatest anxiety and displeasure is, that he formed *immutable and unchangable* purposes concerning them from eternity. But if he formed the *wisest* and *best* possible purposes concerning *them*, and all other beings and objects, what reason have they to complain of him, for forming his purposes respecting them, and fixing them *immutably?* If they hate him for forming the wisest and best purposes concerning them; then they hate him *without a cause*, and are inexcusably guilty. If his purposes were not the wisest and best possible, they would have reason to desire, that he would alter them, and if he did not alter them, they would have reason to complain of his unreasonable conduct towards them. But it appears from what has been said, that all his eternal and immutable purposes are the wisest and best possible; and this ought to silence forever all complaints against God, on account of his decrees.

4. Since God has formed the wisest and best possible plan of creation from eternity; and since this plan comprises all beings, objects, and events; it is impossible for any of his rational creatures to be happy, so long as they are unreconciled to it. This plan is in operation, and will be forever in operation, and will forever affect the character and condition of every one of the human race. Though those, who dislike it, often say, that they cannot understand it; yet it is certain they do understand it, to all intents and purposes. The more they understand it, the more they are unreconciled to it; and the more they are unreconciled to it, the more unhappiness it gives them. Let them say what they will, let them do what they will, and let them be where they will, they are constantly fulfilling the decrees of God respecting them. For he determined from eternity, that they should say what they do say, and do what they do, and be where they are. This is the very doctrine of the divine decrees, and it is only in this light that any hate and oppose it. And do they wish to have it more clearly explained? No; they do not wish to have it more clearly explained, but only to have it *disproved* and *denied*. But it cannot be disproved, without disproving the infinite wisdom, the perfect rectitude, the boundless goodness, and absolute immutability of God. It is in vain, therefore, for any to fly to some texts in scripture to disprove it. It does not depend upon scripture for proof. The proof of it is founded in the very being and perfections of God. To hate the decrees of God, is to hate God himself; and to oppose the decrees of God, is to oppose God himself. It is utterly impossible for the creatures of

God to be happy, while they hate and oppose *him*, with all their hearts. God is happy in executing his decrees; and sinners must be unhappy in hating and opposing them, without effect. The apostle puts the solemn question to the sinner, "Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou *made* me thus?" and decreed to make me thus? God can fully answer this question of the sinner, but it can give him no satisfaction. God may tell him, that he made him thus, and decreed to make him thus, because his infinite wisdom and goodness required him to do it. But will this give any peace or satisfaction to the sinner? This will only increase his enmity and wretchedness.

5. If God's original and eternal and immutable plan of creation be the wisest and best possible; then those, who dislike and oppose the doctrine of decrees, can find no relief, by denying the Bible. Many have freely and openly said, that if they believed the doctrine of divine decrees were contained in the Bible, they would renounce it. But what could such persons gain by renouncing the Bible? They could gain no relief in respect to the doctrine of decrees. This doctrine is plainly written, in capitals, in the Book of Nature; and they must deny the God of Nature, before they can consistently deny the wise and benevolent plan of creation, immutably fixed by the God of Nature. But there is reason to think, that some, and perhaps not a few, have been driven to deism by the doctrine of decrees, which they plainly saw is contained in the Bible. But there is not a single spot between christianity and atheism, upon which any man can firmly fix his foot. Those who deny the doctrine of decrees, and boast that they are *rational* christians, or *rational* deists, discover the blindness of their hearts, more than the acuteness of their understanding. And we hazard nothing, by appealing to their consciences, whether they have not lost more comfort and hope, than they have gained, by renouncing the decrees and the word of God. What if they have got clear of the threatenings of the Gospel? By getting clear of its *threatenings*, they have equally got clear of its *promises*; and when they have got clear of its promises, what *other* promises have they found, or can they find, on which they can safely rest? They have thrown themselves out of all light and all hope, and involved themselves in impenetrable darkness. What Nature, or Nature's God will do for them, they know not. They are certainly unhappy in this state, and if there be another state, they may be unspeakably more unhappy there. All who renounce the decrees of God and the word of God are without God, without Christ, and without all hope, but the forlorn hope. And nothing but awful stupidity keeps them from instant despair, and that stupidity may forsake them at any moment.

6. If God's original and eternal plan of creation is the wisest and best possible plan; then all his friends have always reason to rejoice in his supreme and universal government. For he governs all creatures and all events according to the eternal and immutable counsel of his own will. He reigns as much at one time as another, and as well at one time as another. He is as wise and good

in disappointing the desires and designs of men, as in granting their desires and succeeding their designs. He is as wise and good in taking away, as in bestowing favours. He is as wise and good in sending public judgments, as in bestowing public blessings. His friends, therefore, have always cause to rejoice that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; for in him there is light, and in him there is no darkness at all. God justly enjoins it upon his people to rejoice constantly under his wise and holy government. The command is, "Rejoice in the Lord *alway*." And this duty David discharged with peculiar delight. He says, "I will bless the Lord *at all times:* his praise shall continually be in my mouth. My lips shall greatly rejoice when I sing unto thee. My tongue also shall talk of thy righteousness *all the day long*. I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live; I will sing praise unto my God *while I have my being*. My meditation of him shall be sweet. Rejoice in the Lord, ye righteous: and give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness. The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. O sing unto the Lord, bless his name; show forth his salvation *from day to day*."

The prophet Habbakkuk resolved to rejoice in the darkest times and amidst the greatest calamities. "Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither fruit shall be in the vine; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet I will *rejoice in the Lord*, I will *joy* in the God of my salvation." Such a source of peace and consolation the friends of God perpetually enjoy under the perfectly wise and holy governmect of God. They can *always* look through all secondary causes, and discern the unerring wisdom and perfect goodness of God in all the dispensations of providence and grace, which causes them to rejoice in tribulation, as well as in prosperity. But,

7. If sinners do not rejoice, that God governs all things, according to his original, wise, and perfect plan in the creation of the world; then they are totally depraved and essentially different from saints. It appears, that saints do really rejoice in God's perfectly wise and benevolent plan of creation and government; but it still more clearly appears, that sinners do not rejoice in it. The world is much fuller of the *complaints*, than of the *praises* of God. The great mass of mankind who are sinners, have always been murmuring and complaining under the wise and holy government of God. The unsanctified Israelites did nothing but murmur and repine, while they were miraculously protected, fed, and clothed in the wilderness. The Jews in Babylon boldly charged God with injustice and severity in his treatment of them, according to his wise and holy and immutable purposes. The heathens have been so much disaffected, with the government of the true God, that they have forsaken him, and chosen to be under the government of poor, weak, and malignant deities. Sinners in the land of christian light, where the ways and designs of providence are clearly recorded and unfolded, complain as much as Jews or heathens ever complained, of the eternal and immutable decrees of heaven, and the execution of them. That, which is the ground

of joy and rejoicing to saints, is the ground of murmuring, complaining, enmity, and opposition, to sinners. Saints rejoice, that the Lord reigns over them; but sinners say, in their hearts at least, that he who hath *made* them, shall not reign over them, according to his wise, and holy, and immutable design in their creation. Every sinner in the world, who believes that God immutably decreed all things from eternity, perfectly hates the doctrine, and inwardly, if not openly, opposes it. It is demonstrably certain, that all mankind are by nature *totally* depraved, and in a state of rebelion against God. And if this be true, they are essentially different from saints, who are in a state of reconciliation to God. It is very strange, that any should imagine that they are not enemies to God, when they are conscious that they hate all his designs and all his works, rightly understood. But how many are there in the world, who think they are as good as saints, and that because they hate the decrees of God, which saints love?

8. If God's original plan of creation is the wisest and best possible; then it is an infallible criterion by which all may infallibly determine whether they are saints or sinners. Those who approve of this plan are the friends of God; for they love his character, his perfections, his designs, and all his operations in the works of creation and providence. This is the highest evidence they can have that they are saints. But those who hate his character, perfections, designs, and operations, in the dispensations of providence and grace, are the enemies of God, and have the witness in themselves that they are sinners, and essentially different from saints. Though many deny this to be an infallible criterion, by which men may determine whether they are saints or sinners; yet all must finally be brought to this criterion, and find themselves obliged to decide according to it, whether it be in favor, or against themselves. The sooner, therefore, all bring themselves to this criterion, and determine their character by it, the better. To be reluctant, is an unfavourable symptom. The trial may be easily and quickly made. It may be made at this time, perhaps, as well as any. Do you, or do you not, rejoice, that God's original and immutable plan of creation is the *wisest* and best possible? The question is plain. Let your hearts answer. If they answer in the affirmative, you have reason to believe, that you are really friends to God; but if they answer in the negative, you have as much reason to believe, that you are sinners. And what I say to you is, "Rejoice in the Lord" immediately, and your salvation is secure.

For the Christian Magazine.

REMARKS ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE.

It is not my design to enter into a laboured discussion of this subject; but only to give a few hints to help the understanding of plain readers.

It is often thought, I believe, that people of only common advantages cannot understand some parts of the Bible, and that it is of little importance whether they do. But I believe the Bible is all "profitable for instruction," and that it needs but little reflection to discover the important meaning of all parts of it. There

are, doubtless, obscure passages; and some knowledge of the customs and geography of the eastern world, is very important to help our conceptions; but it is commonly easy to discover the general design of the sacred writers.

The remarks which I am about to make, will relate mainly to the language of prophetical writings and descriptions. I wish at the same time to correct mistaken views, and give correct views in regard to the figurative language employed in this kind of writing, of which there is so much in the Bible.

I remark,

1. That every passage has a meaning. This thought needs to be *impressed*, rather than *proved*. Readers of the Bible are too apt to pass over a passage without considering that it means any thing. If some obscurity rests upon it, on account of its reference to a custom, or the geography of the country, the meaning is entirely lost to them. But if we cannot explain the particular meaning, we may discover the general one, which is what is most important to know.

Some apprehend that the meaning of a whole passage or description is destroyed, if you tell them that only some general idea was meant to be conveyed; and that we cannot deduce any important meaning from each particular part. I do not intend by this first remark to sanction such an opinion. On the contrary, I am aware that in the parables especially, there is danger of mistaking by supposing every particular circumstance to have its corresponding truth.

I remark,

2. That there is usually a particular and a general meaning in the figurative and descriptive language of the Bible. I call that the particular meaning, which is the *literal*, as opposed to the *real* meaning; or which is the *underthought*, in opposition to the *main* —the *letter*, in opposition to the *spirit*. My meaning will be best illustrated by examples.

Psalm lxxxiv. 6. "Who passing through the valley of Baca, make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools." The valley of Baca—"a dry valley." Blessed is the man who passing through a dry valley maketh it a well, or to abound in wells and pools of water. This I call the particular or literal meaning. The general meaning is that that man is blessed, whom no obstacles deter from doing duty. He passes through a dry valley *cheerfully*, as though it abounded in water, that he may "*appear in Zion before God.*"

Isaiah, iv. 1. "In that day seven women shall lay hold on one man, saying, we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name." The literal meaning is obvious. The general idea intended to be conveyed is that *men* would be very *few*, on account of the great desolations and destructive wars, that were to come upon the land.

Isaiah, lxv. 25. "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock." This cannot be literally true even in the Millenium, as I apprehend. Neither can we suppose it probable that wolves and lions will lose their savage nature. But it *will* be true that *men* will lose *their* savage nature. They will live in perfect peace. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord."

Passages without end might be adduced, but these are sufficient to explain what I mean by particular, as opposed to general meaning.

It is important in reading such passages that we should take up the main thoughts; catch the spirit of the instruction, and not lose ourselves in the mazes of particulars. The mineralogist, who passes through a beautiful country examining only the stones and soils—or the botanist, whose only aim is to cull the plants and flowers—receives less pleasure than the painter and the lover of nature, who take in the whole landscape at one view, and receive into their souls the combined effect of all its beauties in one finished picture. The particulars of a description are the dress, the words—not the substance. The main thought is what we are most to notice; for that only is "the mind of the Spirit."

3. Particulars are often introduced merely to fill out the picture, or complete the description. I will explain my meaning. Whatever is the source of the figure, the language is adapted to the nature and circumstances of the thing, from which the figure is taken. And particulars are introduced in regard to the *thing*, which do not specially illustrate the *subject*. They are introduced merely to make the picture a consistent one, or to beautify and impress the thought. I will illustrate my ideas by examples.

Jer. viii. 13. "There shall be no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree, and the leaf shall fade." Desolation is described by a figure taken from the vine and the fig tree. There shall neither be fruit nor leaf on them. They shall be entirely barren. The same thing is represented in the 16th and 17th verses, by the "snorting" and "neighing" of war horses, and the "biting" of serpents. I do not suppose that it was meant to be asserted that either of these things should be literally fulfilled, though it is possible they were. The object was to represent, in this symbolical manner, coming calamities.

Exek. xix. 8. "The nations set against him on every side from the provinces, and spread their net over him; he was taken in their pit." In the former verses, Israel is represented under the similitude of a lion, "devouring men," and "catching prey." Consistently with this metaphor, his captivity is described by being entangled in a "net," or taken in a "pit," because lions were thus taken. In the following verse, the same thing, viz. the captivity of Israel, is represented under the similitude of a vine, (ver. 12,) "plucked up," and "cast down to the ground," "her fruit dried up by the east wind," "her strong rods broken and withered."

Joel, iii. 8. "I will sell your sons and your daughters into the hand of the children of Judah, and they shall sell them to the Sabeans." I do not suppose that Judah ever literally *sold* her enemies; but she *triumphed* over them. This is all that is meant.

Matt. xxiv. 27. "As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; *so* shall the coming of the Son of Man be." i. e. *sudden*. Yet some, from this passage, have expected Christ to come *from the east*.

In all cases like these, the subject must determine the meaning intended to be conveyed, by the figures used, and how much of a representation is literal, and how

much is mere ornamental appendage.

4. The sources of the figures and descriptions, are things with which those to whom the writings are addressed are familiar.

The reasons for this are founded on the nature of the human mind. Familiar objects make the strongest impression on the mind. Comparisons taken from them, will therefore have the same effect. It is for this reason, that some of the most animated and vivid pictures, in the Bible, make a much weaker impression on our minds than on those of eastern people. If the Bible had been originally addressed to us, the figurative language, at least, would probably have been very different from what it now is. But I will proceed to confirm my remark.

One particular object of cultivation, in Palestine and the adjacent countries, was the *vine*. Accordingly, "the vine," "the vineyard," "the wine-press," are often employed in figurative language. How often are calamities represented under the similitude of "ravaging beasts," "wars," "droughts," "famines," "tempests," with all which things the inhabitants of Palestine were familiar. These representations make a much fainter impression on our minds, because we are less familiar with them.

Prosperity is promised to the Jews under the figure of "deliverance from enemies," "fruitful harvests," "feasting and mirth." The kingdom of heaven is represented, in the New Testament, as a place of feasting—of joy and singing. The New Jerusalem is described, Rev. xxi. 10 and onward, as being constructed with walls and gates and streets, which are made of precious stones of every kind—of pearls and gold. It was splendid and glorious—had constant light—its gates were always open—and there was nothing to defile, nothing disagreeable. Every part of this description is such as, to eastern people, familiar with the objects and scenery, is calculated to make the most vivid and lively impression.

How often is there allusion made to an occupation very common—I would say *the* common occupation—to people of the east—that of keeping sheep. Christ is a "shepherd." His chosen people are "his sheep," or "his lambs," or "his flock." Under his protection they are "in his fold," &c. God is spoken of as "a king," "a governor," "a rock," "a tower," "a shield," &c. all which things were familiar, and conveyed the idea of *ruling*, or *protecting*. Trees and shrubs and plants are made use of in figurative language, many of which are peculiar to the country, or at least are not found among us. Isaiah, lv. 13. "Instead of the thorn shall come up the *fir tree*, and instead of the brier shall come up the *myrtle tree*." In no case, I believe, are predictions of future prosperity made under the figure of things with which they (the people to whom they are addressed) are not familiar.

One obvious *inference* is suggested by the last remark, and that is, *that when future blessings, or prosperity, is promised to Jews or Gentiles, we are not to expect the precise, particular things promised.* At least, we are not to expect them as the principal things intended. *Greater* and *better* blessings are promised under the figure of useful and pleasant but familiar things. We have seen

to what mistakes and disappointment the Jews exposed themselves, by taking the promises about their Messiah too literally. They expected "a king," and a conqueror,—a temporal deliverer. These expectations were formed from the language of the Old Testament prophecy respecting him. No one will pretend that the prophecies were not fulfilled, though the Messiah was a very different character from what the Jews expected. The *real* Messiah was infinitely more worthy and valuable than their *imagined* one. So that God was *more than faithful* to his promise, (literally taken,) although their particular expectations were not realized.

The success of the gospel, and the prosperity of the church, are promised in language (so to speak) of a *temporal* and *visible* character. The fir tree and the myrtle tree shall grow up, instead of thorns and briers. "The glory of Lebanon," (probably its beautiful cedars,) "the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box," shall be brought "to beautify the place of my sanctuary." (Isa. lx. 13.) Savage animals shall lose their fierceness, and be no more an object of terror. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb," "the leopard, and the kid; the calf and young lion, shall lie down together." A "little child" may manage them, and play unharmed with the venomous serpent. Now how absurd to expect a literal fulfilment of these things, or to suppose a *literal* fulfilment *better* than the one *really* intended.

To apply this subject to the return of the Jews—is it not rational to suppose, that their final restoration to the favour of God, and their re-union to the church, are predicted in language united to their conceptions and feelings—in language which will convey to their minds an idea of something desirable and pleasant? And how could this be done more efficiently, than by promising them "altars," and "sacrifices,"—an inheritance in the *promised land*—the highest temporal prosperity, deliverance from enemies, and dominion over the nations? And should not these things be literally fulfilled to them, if yet they are converted to Christianity, and enjoy all its heavenly blessings, will they have reason to complain that God has been unfaithful to his promise? If they may enjoy *greater* happiness, mixed in with the other nations of the earth, wherein is the mercy and the faithfulness of God less conspicuous? Was the Messiah the less a blessing to the world, and to the *Jews*, because he was *not* a *king* and *conqueror?*

I do not suppose it is certain that the Jews will not return to the promised land; but I think it cannot rationally be inferred, merely from the *language*, *figurative* and *representative*, as we should expect it to be,—that they will, *as a body*, return,—or that God will not fulfil all he intended, and confer as great blessings upon them, if they should be converted to Christianity, and remain where they are. Let them embrace the gospel, and receive the temporal as well as spiritual blessings which it has a tendency to confer, and they will be more happy than they could be in the peaceful enjoyment of their "land flowing with milk and honey," without it.

My last remark is, that the general meaning, not the particular, (the spirit, not the letter,) is what is meant to be conveyed. In regard to the prophecies re-

specting the Messiah, it will not be denied that God accomplished them just as he meant to, when they were delivered. And the Jews erred by interpreting them too literally. So, doubtless, will others err, when they rest upon an exact and literal fulfilment of every prophecy. Some regard should be had to the circumstances existing, or likely to exist, at the accomplishment of the prophecy. We ought to be satisfied, if God is as *good* as his promise. "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

CARPUS.

For the Christian Magazine.

INFLUENCE OF POPULAR OPINION ON THE PULPIT.

THE influence of popular opinion over the pulpit, is strikingly exhibited in the change that has taken place in many of our churches. The tendency of this influence to smooth down the strong language of our Fathers, is, in many parts of New England, very great; and, as being intimately connected with ministerial success, it deserves serious attention.

The heat of theological controversy produced, a few years since, perhaps an excess of the language of terror in the orthodox pulpits of our land; and all the eloquence, and wit, and ridicule, of the Unitarians was arrayed against it. The feelings of the natural heart were all on the liberal side of this controversy. Men do not love to have their consciences disturbed by strong and vivid representations of the consequences of their sins; they infinitely rather be told of their good deeds, if they have any, and if not, of the rewards of those which they ought to have. Hence the clamor, raised at first by those who were opposed to orthodoxy, has become in a great measure popular, and the effect has been to exclude from our pulpits much of the plain, strong language, of our pilgrim fathers, of the leaders of the reformation, and of apostles and prophets.

I speak not of those pulpits where the doctrines of our fathers are rejected;—nor of those whose occupants are steering their course between truth and error to please the advocates of both; who make it a business to muffle up the truths they profess to preach, in such ambiguous language, that all may interpret them to favour their own theories; at least, that none may be offended;—but of those which are the avowed advocates of the doctrines of the reformation; when I say that the influence of popular feeling has wrought a change in many of them, in regard to plainness of speech.

The ministers in these pulpits believe what God says of the wickedness of the human heart; but deem it impolite to tell men that they are odious and abominable in the sight of God, when their conduct is decent and moral. Their hearers will be offended to be told that their carnal hearts are enmity against God, and are full of evil only and continually. Hence some phraseology is adopted, less repugnant to the popular feeling. Men are told that they are depraved,—are destitute of real holiness and in great danger of being lost—all which they hear very calmly, without once dreaming that these smooth speeches are meant to speak out the thunders of the

violated law, and convict them of rebellion against God.

These ministers believe what God has said with regard to the future state of the wicked; that however fair their characters may be in this world, however lovely their disposition, and amiable their manners, if they die without repentance, they will all be turned into hell with the nations that forget God. Yet to preach to a congregation of amiable and moral impenitent sinners, that these tremendous threatnings are denounced against them; that if *they* die unconverted, their amiable qualities, the loveliness of their social character, all on which they pride themselves in this life, will not save them from being companions of the polluted and vile, where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched—to preach these things in the plain language of Baxter or of Paul, is shocking to the sensibilities of such hearers. They can easily conceive that some vile sinners in the days of the Apostles, and perhaps some abandoned wretches now, deserve such a fate; but that they, who are almost christians, should be subjected to this awful doom, merely for being lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, they cannot believe. Nay, the very mention of the word hell, is shocking to their delicacy, and if used in any connexion with characters like theirs, betrays an unpardonable want of charity and tenderness in the preacher.

How would the popular feeling which requires this smooth inoffensive sort of preaching have endured the plain direct address of Doddridge, of Luther, or of Paul? Did they temporize, and file down the strong language of scripture, lest they should offend their hearers, or be called harsh and uncharitable? The threatnings of the law, in their hands, were the lightnings of heaven, flashing conviction on the conscience, and striking through the soul—making their hearers dead to sin, that they may be made alive to righteousness. These threatnings, in the hands of too many of our popular ministers, are these lightnings tamed, and carried round the conscience in conductors, or exhibited in the harmless form of electrical experiment; if they touch any one it is with such a gentle shock as produces but a momentary sensation.

But is there no danger of giving needless offence by the use of terrific language? Undoubtedly there is. But it is not the danger to which ministers in this age are exposed; nor are the consequences of this error half so much to be deprecated, as are those of the opposite extremes. The surgeon, who, by the unskilful use of his instruments, gives needless pain in amputating a limb, deserves censure; but he who, through fear of giving pain to his patient, neglects to use his knife or saw, till the gangrene has pervaded the whole system, deserves vastly more censure. I would not have a preacher, with cold unfeeling heart, deal out the terrors of the law, as if he were the minister of vengeance, to his hearers, for this is not his business; nor would I have him keep his people always under the sound of the thunders of Sinai; Paul did not so. But when he speaks on this subject, as he sometimes must if he is a faithful man, let him speak the plain, full language of the Bible; let him call things by their right names, and not strive with studied phrases to avoid offending his hearers by

telling them plainly what God has said concerning them.

If he would have the sword of the Spirit do execution, let him not blunt its point by qualifying language, but aim it at the consciences of his hearers, with all the keenness which it has in the naked form which inspiration gives it.

Let me not be misunderstood. No minister should say unpleasant things to his hearers because they are unpleasant, but because they are true. The severity of *manner* sometimes assumed by those who preach the terrors of the divine law, cannot be too carefully avoided, but in avoiding this, if we would be faithful ministers, let us not omit the alarming truths of the gospel, nor preach them in such a tame, half earnest manner, that they will awaken no emotion in our hearers.

The experience of eighteen hundred years has proved, that the doctrines of the gospel cannot be so dressed up as to be pleasant to the unrenewed heart, unless they are concealed by their dress. Their first object is to convince men of their guilt and danger; and this it is utterly impossible to do, without awakening painful emotions; as impossible as to amputate a diseased limb, without pain. Sinful affections, "close twisted with the fibres of the heart," must be torn out; sinful practices, long indulged, cut off by the sword of the Spirit; feelings of penitence and self reproach must be awakened; and till this is done, the effect of the gospel on the heart of the sinner is not produced.

Now the reason why so many impenitent persons sit without one unpleasant emotion under the smooth preaching of the gospel, is, that it is so presented, or rather covered, that it does not touch the conscience. The preacher is unto them as the very lovely song of one who hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; they hear his words, and go away admiring his manner, without once dreaming that there is anything for them to do, or to suffer. Was it thus with the hearers of the Apostles, or with those of Tennant or Whitefield? Is it thus with those of many living preachers, in whose hands the word of God becomes quick and powerful? Inquire in the revivals in our churches, and you will find the plain, unaccommodating language of the Bible preached, and you will find many too complaining that it is harsh and severe. To change the heart, is in all cases the work of the Spirit; but it is as really accomplished by means, as any other work. These means are the impression of truth on the conscience; and this is ordinarily effected by the plain, pungent preaching of the doctrines of the cross. This is that sword of the Spirit, which is quick and powerful; and that soldier might as well expect success, who in fighting the battles of his country should keep his sword always sheathed, lest its sharp edge should give pain to his enemies, as that minister expect success, who in fighting the battles of the Lord of Hosts, muffles up the sword of the Spirit in smooth and palliating language. XANTHUS.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

WELCOME the Cross of Christ, and bear it triumphantly; but see it be indeed Christ's Cross, not thy own. *Wilcox.*

From the Utica Christian Repository.

USE OF MEANS.

If all things are fixed and certain, where is the propriety of using means?

God is the efficient cause of all things. As an infinitely wise, intelligent, and powerful being, he always operates according to the same eternal and unchangeable plan. "Known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world." With him nothing is past or future. Eternity is present before him. He sees at one view all possible events that can ever take place throughout his vast dominions. He now knows, and always has known, with perfect certainty, what will be the moral character of every individual in this world, as well as his final state in the world to come.

And that God's foreknowledge of future events implies that such events are certain, must be acknowledged by every candid person. For to say that God certainly knows an event will take place, and that it is nevertheless uncertain whether it will take place or not, is plainly irrational and absurd. All things then are fixed and certain.

But the previous certainty of future events does not destroy the use of means. Means are as necessary as though the end had never been decreed, and notwithstanding the decree, the end will never be accomplished without them. This truth is clearly taught, confirmed, and illustrated, in various parts of sacred history. In the ordinary course of divine providence, there is no good bestowed upon man, no judgment sent, and no event whatsoever brought to pass, without the instrumentality of means. Judgments are sent as punishments for sin, and blessings are bestowed in consequence of the exertions and prayers of God's people.

God has decreed and foretold that he will take the people of Israel from among the heathen, and bring them into their own land, and sprinkle clean water upon them, and give them a new heart, and cause them to walk in his statutes and to keep his judgments. This event is therefore certain. But it is equally certain that it will never be brought about without the use of means. Without the exertions of God's people, Israel will never be restored. For God hath expressly said, "I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them."

In the voyage of the apostle Paul from Cesarea to Rome, as they had proceeded a considerable distance on their way, a violent tempest suddenly arose, the horizon was overspread with thick clouds, and the ship was exceedingly driven with the wind. All hope that they should be saved was then taken away. They were in constant expectation of perishing in the deep. In this hour of extreme danger, an angel of God appeared unto Paul, exhorted him to take courage, and made known the Divine decree that none of them should be lost, but that every one should get safe to land. Here then the decree had gone forth. The event was as sure as the veracity of Him who cannot lie. But suppose they had at that time neglected the use of means. Suppose they had yielded themselves to the tempest, to be driven whithersoever the violence of the wind and the waves might carry them. Or suppose they had gone further, and said, We shall surely be saved, do what we will—and had plunged them-

selves into the sea. Would this have been rational? Or would they have had any reason to believe that they should not perish? Surely not. And the apostle himself, to whom God's purpose to save all in the ship had been immediately revealed, when he perceived that the shipmen, who alone were skilled in managing the vessel, were about to make their escape, said unto the centurion, "except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved."

The possession of the land of Canaan by the children of Israel, was decreed and foretold many centuries before it took place. The event was absolutely certain. But what a variety and long course of means was employed to bring it about. Abraham must be called; Isaac and Jacob be born and have families; Joseph must be sold to Potiphar, and promoted by Pharaoh; his father's family go down into Egypt, there multiply and be oppressed. Moses must be born, exposed in the Nile, and adopted by Pharaoh's daughter. A great number of moral agents were raised up, and many instruments were employed. God's people, although they knew the event was certain, did not on that account lessen their own exertions. And the Lord himself, to accomplish his promises, "shook the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land."

Thus it is abundantly taught in sacred history that the previous certainty of future events does in no way destroy the use of means. Many more passages might be cited, but these are sufficient. Means are as necessary as though the end had never been decreed.

We will now inquire more particularly why they are necessary. Means of themselves have no effect. Events can be brought to pass without them. In the creation of the world, "God spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast; he said, Let there be light, and there was light." He is able to work all things in the same way. Means then are not necessary in the nature of things, but have a constituted necessity. God can with perfect ease work without them, but in his wise constitution of things, chooses to employ them. But why does he choose to employ them? This question it may be difficult to answer. We have reason however to believe, that it is to secure the free moral agency of his intelligent creatures. If means were not employed, it is easy to see that men would not be actuated by motives; and if men were not actuated by motives they would not be moral agents. God has therefore established a kind of connexion between means and ends. And this connexion is so constituted, as not only to secure our free moral agency, but to cause us to exert that agency. We act in view of some end we wish to accomplish. We see that the accomplishment of that end has some important connexion with certain means; and those means we invariably employ as the only way to obtain our purpose.

But suppose things were otherwise constituted. Suppose God had not decreed future events. Means of themselves would never effect any thing. And as God is the efficient cause of all things, nothing would be done unless he did it. And it would be altogether uncertain what he would do, for he would not have determined what to do. It would not be certain that he will reward the righteous and punish the wicked, for he would not have determined

so to do. Neither would it be certain but that he will save the wicked, and punish the righteous, for he would not have determined not to do it. The same uncertainty would also be introduced into all temporal affairs. God would not have decreed, and consequently it would be uncertain, what means would be made to accomplish any particular end, or whether the end would be accomplished in any way whatever. If therefore we should use means with design to accomplish any end, we should have no better reason to expect that they would be made effectual to the accomplishment of that end, than that they would be made effectual to the accomplishment of some other end, or of none at all.

We see then that the previous certainty of future events is so far from destroying the use of means that it is one principal encouragement to use them.

But suppose again that God had decreed future events, but had established no connexion between means and ends. The events would then be certain it is true, but how to bring them about we could never know. How wise then, and how much to be preferred, is the present constitution of things! God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass. All things are fixed and certain. Chance cannot interrupt his plans. Fatality cannot thwart his purposes. His glorious designs of grace and salvation, will be promoted with uninterrupted success, till they are fully accomplished according to his pleasure.

But the doctrine of decrees, as it necessarily includes personal election, is often wrested by sinners to their own destruction. If, say they, the final state of every individual is fixed and certain, "the elect will be saved do what they please, and the reprobate will be damned do what they can." That the elect will be saved, and that the reprobate will be damned, is true. But that the elect will be saved do what they please, and that the reprobate will be damned do what they can, is not true. Let sinners beware how they cavil with the word of God. The truth is, they are not pleased with Christ and his salvation. They will not come unto him that they might have life. Our repentance and faith are as much decreed as our salvation. If I am elected to be saved, yet, I shall not be saved, unless I repent and believe. It was certain that the crew who sailed with Paul from Cesarea, would get safe to land. But this they could not have done had not the shipmen remained in the vessel. It is decreed concerning him that puts his trust in the Lord, that God shall give his angels charge concerning him to keep him. And the devil, in tempting our Saviour, drew from this decree an argument similar to the one which he puts into the mouths of sinners now. He took Jesus up into the holy city, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, "if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." It was indeed decreed that Christ should be preserved. But if he had cast himself down he would not have been preserved. Such an act would have been presumption. It would have been tempting God, as Christ evidently implied, when he answered, "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

Now Christ is our example. And when sinners are tempted to abandon themselves to the unrestrained pursuits of sin, in consequence of the doctrine of decrees, let them make a reply to the tempter similar to the one which Christ made, if they would not cast themselves down into the bottomless pit of everlasting misery. A. Z.

DEVOTIONS OF THE FAMILY.

THE pious Cecil, in his Remains, has the following. "Family religion is of unspeakable importance. Its effects will greatly depend upon the manifest sincerity of the head of the family. If his children and servants do not see his prayers exemplified in his *temper* and *manners*, they will be disgusted with his religion. Tediousness will weary them. Fine language will shoot over them. Gloomliness will make them dread religion, as a hard service. Let them be met as for a most delightful service. Let them find it savory, simple, plain, tender, heavenly. Worship thus conducted may be used as an engine of vast power in a family. It diffuses a sympathy through the members. It calls off the mind from the deadening effects of worldly affairs. It arrests every member as with a morning and evening sermon, in the midst of all the cares of life. —It says; There is a God! There is a spiritual world! There is a life to come! It fixes the idea of responsibility in the mind. It furnishes a tender and judicious father, or master, with an opportunity of gently glancing at faults, where a direct admonition might be inexpedient.

"And children and servants should see us acting on the Psalmist's declaration, "I will speak of thy testimony before kings." If a great man happen to be present, let him see that the devout head of the family esteems him nothing before the word of God."

DELIBERATION; OR THE TOWN CLERK OF EPHESUS.

DELIBERATION, which is the act of considering things before an undertaking or making choice, is very essential to our honor and comfort in the present state. "I have heard one say (observes Dr. Mather) that there was a gentleman, in the 19th chapter of Acts, to whom he was more indebted than to any man in the world.—This was he whom our translation calls the Town-clerk of Ephesus, whose counsel it was to do nothing rashly. Upon any proposal of consequence, it was an usual speech with him—"we shall first advise with the Town-clerk of Ephesus." One, in a fond compliance with a friend, forgetting the Town-clerk, may do that in haste which he may repent at leisure—may do what may cost him several hundreds of pounds, besides troubles, which he would not have undergone for thousands."

ANECDOTES OF GEORGE III. LATE KING OF ENGLAND.

HIS Majesty was accustomed, after hearing a Sermon, to walk and discourse with the preacher. On such an occasion, speaking to a fashionable preacher, he asked him whether he had read bishops Andrews, Sanderson, Sherlock, &c. The pigmy divine replied, 'No, please your Majesty, my

reading is all modern. The writers of whom your Majesty speaks are now obsolete, though I doubt not they might have been very well for those days.' The King, turning upon his heel, rejoined, with pointed emphasis, 'There were giants on the earth in *those days.* —

When the King was repairing his palace at Kew, one of the workmen, who was a pious character, was particularly noticed by his Majesty, and he often held conversation with him of some length upon serious subjects. One Monday morning, the King went, as usual, to watch the progress of the work, and not seeing this man in his customary place, inquired the reason of his absence. He was answered evasively, and, for some time, the other workmen avoided telling his Majesty the truth; at last, however, upon being more strictly interrogated, they acknowledged, that not having been able to complete a particular job on the Saturday night, they had returned to finish it on the following morning. This man alone had refused to comply, because he considered it a violation of the Christian Sabbath; and, in consequence of what they called his obstinancy, he had been dismissed entirely from his employment. 'Call him back immediately,' exclaimed the good King, 'the man who refused doing his ordinary work on the Lord's Day, IS THE MAN FOR ME. Let him be sent for.' The man was accordingly replaced, and the King ever after showed him particular favor.

UNPROFITABLE BUSINESS.

THE National Philanthropist, a publication recently undertaken in Boston, with reference chiefly to the growing evils of intemperance in our country, contains an estimate founded on the number of licenses granted in that city the present year, from which it appears that *more than the hundredth part of the whole population are employed in retailing liquors to the other part.* "And these licences relate only to the retailing business; add to this that of the merchant to supply the retailers and country trade, and it clearly appears that one of the most extensive branches of business in Boston is of no kind of use to society; but on the contrary is the source of innumerable evils—pauperism and crime—misery and destruction among the people."

There is another 'branch of business' which is growing up to a great magnitude among us, and producing evils scarcely less extensive or less palpable than that of selling ardent spirits. We wish some one would undertake to inform the public how many persons there are engaged in *selling lottery tickets*, and thus employing a great amount of time and capital for purposes of merely nominal benefit to society, but productive far and wide of mischief. It is remarkable that at the very time when in England lotteries have just been abolished because of the evils which attended them, they should with us be multiplied beyond example. There is no one passion which is so universally addressed in the United States at present, as is the love of this species of enterprise. It would seem as if our legislators assembled for the set purpose of creating lotteries. Our readers are aware that eleven of these games of hazard took place the last year in Maryland, and that a still greater number are contem-

plated for the present year. We have been informed by a gentleman engaged in the lottery business, that in a smaller State than Maryland, there are now in operation *twenty three* lotteries. One has just been granted by the legislature of Connecticut, now in session; and several more were waiting the sanction of that body, but we are happy to say, are negatived.—Nearly forty existing lotteries in two of our smallest States! Will any one inform us how many there are in all the remaining States and Territories?

Chris. Spec.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

UNITARIANISM SOUND DOCTRINE.—*A Sermon preached at Waltham, at the Ordination of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, Feb. 15, 1826. By Nathaniel Whitman, Minister of Billerica.*

[Continued from page 224.]

IN a former number, the indefiniteness of Mr. Whitman's statements, and the consequent deceptive manner of his discussion, were the subjects of our remarks. We design, in this number, to examine his reasoning in favour of Unitarianism, and against the Trinity. According to the plan of discussion, which he proposed, his first object was, to "exhibit proof of the divinity of Unitarianism." By this singular phraseology, we suppose him to mean, that Unitarianism is a doctrine of the scriptures. The proof of this he supposes, "will be the more readily perceived, and its value the better understood, if viewed in connexion with the doctrine to which it is opposed." "That I may not subject myself to the charge of misrepresenting the views of our Trinitarian brethren, I will," he says, "in presenting their views, use their own favourite language. 'There are,' say they, 'three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one God, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory.' 'This doctrine of the distinction of persons in the unity of essence is a fundamental truth.' 'And them that deny that there are these three distinct persons in one Godhead we ought to judge,' say they, 'to be blasphemous and damnable heretics.'"

Our readers will notice, that Mr. W. is here careful, not only to state, in their own words, the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is believed by Trinitarians, but to give also their views of the moral character of those who reject this doctrine. They will also, probably, have the curiosity to inquire, what the views which Trinitarians entertain of the moral character of those who reject their doctrine, has to do with the doctrine itself? Or, how the dwelling upon this point, would help the author in his proof of Unitarianism? These are, indeed, questions which we cannot answer. But there is an object, of some importance, which we apprehend might be answered by

this management; and it is not impossible, Mr. W. had the sagacity to perceive it. It is this: The representation of Trinitarians, as believing and saying, that Unitarians are "blasphemous and damnable heretics," would naturally excite very strong prejudices in the minds of his readers, against the former, and in favour of the latter; and procure for him a more ready assent to the sentiments, which he might wish to inculcate. We see not how else the above quotation could be of the least service to his cause. But the application of it is unauthorized, and unjust. This he represents, without qualification or exception, as *the* language of Trinitarians. It is also represented as their *favorite* language. Mr. W. cannot deny, that the impression, which this representation is calculated, if not designed, to make upon the minds of his readers, is, that Trinitarians, as a *body*, say, and choose to say, of Unitarians, that they are "blasphemous and damnable heretics." Now we would ask him, whether the fact, that more than a hundred and fifty years ago, Vincent, in his Exposition of the Assembly's Catechism, used this expression, authorises him to speak of it as the favourite language of Trinitarians, at the present day? We would, moreover, ask him, whether he sincerely believes, that they do generally use this language? Admitting what is probably true, that they consider Unitarians as heretics; do they speak of them, and treat them as blasphemers? Does not Mr. W. know, that very few, if any Trinitarians now, ever use the language which he has quoted? Why, then, should he endeavor to fasten the odium of this upon them all? Why should he leave all modern Trinitarian writers, and overlook all the courteous and respectful language which has been used by them in their controversies with Unitarians, and go more than a hundred and fifty years back, and look out one of the strongest and most objectionable expressions which he could find, and present it to the public, as their favourite language? This may be thought to be good policy; but is it honesty? We cannot but believe, that a man, who sincerely desires to influence his audience to receive the truth, upon its own proper evidence, would avoid this kind of management, even if the language of his opponents was as objectionable as this which Mr. W. has quoted. It is an acknowledged fact, that men of all parties, have occasionally used language, respecting their opponents, which neither truth nor propriety would justify. But every fair mind, will endeavour to examine the evidence of the truth or falsehood of their doctrine, independently of the expressions, which they have used in regard to the character of their opponents. Nor is it less evident, to our minds, that every public teacher, whose leading object is, to influence his hearers to receive the truth, upon its own proper evidence, will endeavor to avoid exciting any improper feelings toward either the friends, or the enemies of the doctrine in question.

To the language quoted by Mr. W. as expressive of the *doctrine* of the Trinity, we shall not object. Whether it is metaphysically true, in every respect, or not, we shall not attempt to decide. It expresses, with sufficient clearness, for all practical purposes, what we believe is true, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But to the

doctrine, as thus expressed, Mr. W. says, "they," Unitarians, have two objections. The first which he states, is, "It is not to be found in the Bible." His reasoning, in support of this objection, is so remarkable, we deem it proper to quote the whole of it. Meaning the doctrine of the Trinity, he says, "It is mere human hypothesis. Throughout the whole Bible, you do not find a single passage, which explicitly and unequivocally teaches this doctrine. It is no part of revelation. It is the mere opinion of fallible men. As such, we oppose it. Our reverence for the word of God, and our regard for the souls of men, compel and constrain us to oppose the monstrous tenet, that it is essential to salvation to receive, as of equal authority, the word of Jehovah and the opinion of man." If our readers are not now convinced, that there is no such doctrine as that of the Trinity in the Bible, they must remember, it is not because they have not been told so. If the assertion of Mr. W., often repeated, and made with great apparent warmth and boldness, is sound argument, they must certainly feel themselves bound to reject the doctrine. But we hope that they will consider this as the assertion of a "fallible man," and search the scriptures for themselves, before they decide upon so important a point. If Mr. W. had here quoted the passages of scripture, which have been supposed, by many of the greatest and best of men, in every age of the Christian church, to assert or imply the doctrine of the Trinity, and so explained them as to show his hearers, that they neither assert nor imply any such thing, he would have done something worthy of himself, and the occasion on which he spake. But mere assertion, where proof might justly be expected, although several times repeated in the space of a few sentences, and made with an air of confidence and triumph, will be considered by the most intelligent and reflecting, only as evidence of the weakness of his cause. The fact is, the doctrine of the Trinity is thought by its friends to be very *clearly* taught in the Bible. They pretend to derive it from no other source whatever. The reason, and the only reason, why they receive this doctrine is, the scriptures, interpreted according to the known rules of interpreting other writings, appear to them unequivocally to teach it. They find themselves wholly unable to understand a very large class of scripture texts, but upon the principle, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are the one only living and true God; and that there is, in the Divine nature, such a distinction as authorises the separate application of the personal pronouns, I, thou, and he, to each of these names; or in other words, that God exists in three distinct and equal persons. It matters not, and Mr. W. knows that it makes no kind of difference, as it respects the truth of the doctrine in question, whether it be taught in the Bible expressly, in so many words, or by fair inference, or implication. Notwithstanding his abundant use of such expressions as the following: "It is not found in the Bible. It cannot be expressed in scripture language;" he knows that a doctrine may be as clearly taught in the scriptures, when it is not there expressed in precisely the same form in common use, as when the terms are the very same which the Holy Ghost has

dictated. He has himself attempted to show the "divinity of *Unitarianism.*" But he need not be told, that there is no such term as this in the Bible. All he expected to prove is, that what he means by this term, is there taught. But it may be thought incumbent on us, here to exhibit some proof, that the doctrine of the Trinity, or the truth which we mean by this term, is taught in the scriptures. To this we shall not object, although the design of this review is rather to expose the sophistry of the author's reasoning, in the sermon before us, than to enter into a labored vindication of our own views. In reply to the assertion of Mr. W. that the doctrine of the Trinity "is not in the Bible," it may be expected, that we shall quote the passage found in 1 John, v. 7, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." But in this review, we shall make no use of this passage, merely because we know that our opponents generally dispute its genuineness. We deem it our duty, however, to state, that after the most thorough investigation of the question, respecting this passage, which our means of information will permit, we cannot but view it as a part of the sacred text. But for the reason already assigned, we dispense with the use of it, at the present time, and rest the proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, solely upon the fact, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are, in the scriptures, repeatedly spoken of as distinct persons; and that the names, titles, attributes, works, and worship peculiar to God, are ascribed to each, in a manner totally inconsistent with their ascription to any mere creature. The form in which Baptism is required to be administered, clearly indicates a personal distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.—"Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The same distinction of person is brought to view, and kept up in all the following passages. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. For through him, that is Christ, we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Now it must be obvious, that in all these passages, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are spoken of as distinct persons, and that works appropriate to each, are ascribed to them. We need not say, that the word person, is here used in a peculiar sense. This must be obvious to every one. There is no word in our language, which does not, when used respecting God, necessarily mean more or less, than when applied to man.

But Unitarians admit a personal distinction between the Father and the Son. They deny only the personality of the Holy Ghost, believing, if we understand them, that this is only the *power, energy,* or operations of God. But in the passages above quoted, and in many others, the Holy Ghost is spoken of, in a manner, as clearly indicative of *his* personality as

the manner, in which the Father and Son are spoken of, is indicative of *theirs*. Our readers will be satisfied, we apprehend, that the term, Holy Ghost, cannot mean merely the power, or operations of God, in such passages as we quoted above, by only reading them with the substitution of this meaning, for the term itself. Let the experiment be tried in the following passage, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the" power of God, or of the operations of God. It is certainly very difficult to conceive of any meaning, to a command like this, to baptize in the name of the power, or operations of God. And if any definite meaning can be affixed to such a command, we apprehend it is impossible to distinguish it from the command to baptize in the name of the Father. But who can read this passage, as it now stands in the New Testament, and not be convinced, that baptizing in the name of the Holy Ghost, is something different from baptising in the name of the Father? If it is not, why are both enjoined? Besides, what an awkwardness, and strange distortion does this construction of the term, Holy Ghost, give to the words of our Saviour? "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the" power, or operations of God! To suppose that two of these, in whose name baptism is to be administered, are persons, and the other only an attribute, or a work of one of them, is so unnatural, so contrary to what the language of the passage most obviously suggests, that it appears to us like an outrage upon all the known laws of exegesis. We do not believe, that any person would ever have thought of denying the personality of the Holy Ghost, in this passage, while he admitted that of the Father, and the Son; had he not perceived that the passage, in its most obvious construction, has an unfavourable bearing upon a theory, which he wished to maintain. It would be easy here to quote a number of passages of scripture, in proof of the Deity of the Holy Ghost; but as this is not, we believe, denied by any who admit his personality, we shall save ourselves the trouble of quoting, and our readers of perusing them.

But while Unitarians admit the personality of the Father and the Son, they deny their equality; and in their efforts to disprove the doctrine of the Trinity, they spend their chief force, in efforts to show that Christ is not truly God. The principal thing to be done, therefore, in order to defend the doctrine against their attacks, is to prove the Deity of Christ. This is certainly all that we need to do, in reply to Mr. W. Before advancing any thing, in proof of this point, however, we deem it proper to remind our readers, that when we say, that Christ is God, we do not mean to exclude his humanity. It is a part of our belief, that he was both God and man, mysteriously united. When we say that Christ, the Son, is equal to the Father, we always speak in reference to his divine nature. In his human nature, he is confessedly inferior to the Father; and, in the office which he sustains, he is subordinate. His equality with the Father, in his divine nature, and his subjection to him in that nature which he assumed, are both recognized by the Apostle, in the

following passage, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: *who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:* but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and *was made in the likeness of men:* and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Now we believe it may be clearly shown, from the scriptures, that Christ, in his highest nature, is truly God. The truth of this, our readers must have already seen, in some degree, illustrated, not only by the passage just quoted, but by those in which he is named distinctly, in connexion with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and associated with them, in a manner totally inconsistent with his being a mere creature, however exalted. Baptism is required to be administered in his name, and in the name of the Father. But what mind is not shocked at the thought, of associating a mere creature with God himself, in terms which confer the same honour upon the one, as upon the other. In one of the Apostolic benedictions, above quoted, "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost," are sought; and the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ is mentioned first. Here we would ask, does not this mode of expression, naturally imply, that Christ is equal with God the Father, and that the grace of the one, is of the same importance as the love of the other? One thing is certain, whatever may be the difference between these two persons, the Apostle makes none, in the language which he uses respecting them. They are associated together, in terms of perfect equality, and so far as honour is conferred upon either, by the language which he uses, the same is conferred upon both. But we ask, could an inspired Apostle be guilty of so great an impropriety, of so gross a transgression of the law of God, as familiarly to associate the ever blessed God with a mere creature?

But if our readers will have patience with us, we will show, that the same names, titles, attributes, works and worship, which the scriptures require to be ascribed to God, and to him only, are all ascribed to Jesus Christ. Our limits, however, will allow us to quote but a very few of the many passages, in which this is done. The scriptures frequently give Christ the name of God, in the same unqualified manner in which they give it to the Father. This is done in the following passage: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." "*This is the true God and eternal life.*" In the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, we find the following passage, in which Christ is called God, in the most absolute and unlimited manner. Speaking of the Israelites, the Apostle says, "whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, *who is over all, God blessed for ever.*"— The name of God, is given to Christ, by John, in the first chapter of his gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." In this passage, it

will be perceived, that he is called God, in the strict and proper sense of the term; because, besides the name of God, the creation of the universe is ascribed to him.

There are certain *attributes*, peculiar to God, which the scriptures ascribe to Christ. Among these are Omniscience, Omnipresence, Eternal existence, Immutability, and Almighty power. That Omniscience is an attribute peculiar to God, is a truth incontrovertably supported by the following, among many other passages of scripture, "For thou, *even thou only*, knowest the hearts of all the children of men,—I the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways." But this knowledge of the heart, which belongs to God only, is, in other passages of the scriptures, repeatedly ascribed to Christ. The following is his own language to the church at Thyatira. "And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." It is God, and he alone, who is every where present. "Can any one hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, saith the Lord?—Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?" But although God evidently intended by this expression to say something of himself, which is true of none of his creatures; yet there is nothing more in his language, than what Christ affirms of himself. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," said he to his disciples, "there am I in the midst of them." And when he had given them their commission, to go and preach the gospel to every creature, he subjoined, "Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Is it possible, reader, that Christ should fulfil this promise, if he were not truly God? We need not here detain our readers, to prove by quotations from the Bible, that God is Eternal, Immutable, and Almighty, or to show, by any course of reasoning, that these attributes can belong to no other being. But it is important here to show, that all these attributes are ascribed to Christ. His Immutability and Eternal existence, are both implied, in the following passage. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to day, and forever." A plain intimation, that he had existed from eternity, is found in his words to John, when he revealed himself to him upon the isle of Patmos. "I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more." There is another passage, in close connexion with this, in which his Almighty power, as well as his eternal existence, is clearly asserted. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come the Almighty." He could not say, that he was the first and the last, unless he had existed from eternity. Nor could he declare himself the Almighty, unless he knew that he was the same in power with God the Father. His assertion of his Eternity implies his self-existence and independence; which are attributes of no creature, and which obviously can be communicated to no creature.

The scriptures not only ascribe the attributes peculiar to God, to the Lord Jesus Christ, but the *works* by which God is distinguished from all his creatures. Creation is a work peculiar to God.

"*He that built all things is God.*" —*I am the Lord that maketh all things;* that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone;* that spreadeth abroad the earth by *myself.* But we have already seen, that the work of creation is ascribed to Christ. After having said that he was in the beginning with God, and that he was God, John adds, "*And all things were made by him, and without him* was not any thing made that was made." Paul asserts the same truth, in language equally plain and unequivocal, and with it, the fact, that all things were created for the promotion of his glory, and preserved in existence by his agency. "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers, *all* things were created *by* him, and *for* him, and he is *before* all things, and *by him all things consist.*" I might here add, that the government of the world, and the judgment of the world, works, which are repeatedly ascribed to God, and which it is obvious none but God is qualified to perform, are also ascribed to Christ. But we hasten to say, that Christ required mankind "to *honour* him, even as they honour the Father;" that the Father himself has given commandment, saying, "let all the Angels of God worship him;" and that he is known to have been the object of religious homage, not only to his primitive disciples, and the early Christians; but to all the saints and angels in heaven. The early Christians were known, as those who called on the name of the Lord Jesus. Paul begins his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in these words, "To the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place, *call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.*" This passage plainly implies, that it was the practice of Christians to pray to Christ. The dying prayer of the martyr Stephen, was offered to Christ. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit." But to place the fact, that Christ is a proper object of religious homage, beyond all controversy, we will only direct their attention, one moment, to what John tells us he saw in heaven. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN *to receive power and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.* And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, *Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto* HIM who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB for ever and ever." Here it is evident, that Christ has been the object of religious worship to all holy beings, and that he has received from them precisely the *same* homage, which they paid the Father. But is it not a well known fact, that the scriptures forbid the worship of any being but God? Has he not expressly declared, "that he will not give his glory to another?" Is it not written "*thou shalt worship no other God.*" In view, then, of the fact, that Christ has actually re-

ceived in heaven, and from the earth, the same religious homage which holy beings render to the Father, how can we avoid the conclusion, that he is, in a mysterious sense, one with the Father, and in his nature, truly divine? Is it possible to reconcile this fact, and the other, equally well supported by the testimony of the scriptures, that he bears the name of God, that all the distinguishing attributes of God are ascribed to him, that he does, and often has done, and is still to do, the works which none but God can perform, with the opinion now so frequently avowed, that he is a mere creature? If there are any of our readers that still think so, we beg them to consider, as additional evidence of his real divinity, that the Spirit of God is frequently spoken of in scripture, as the Spirit of Christ; that the vision of God is represented as the vision of Christ; and that tempting God, is the same thing as tempting Christ. Peter calls the Spirit, under the influence of which the prophets uttered their predictions, which is in the scriptures generally called the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ. "Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of *Christ* which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." Paul sometimes speaks of the Spirit which dwells in Christians, called most frequently the Spirit of God, or the Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of Christ. "But ye are not in the flesh, says Paul to the Romans, but in the Spirit, if so be the *Spirit of God* dwell in you. Now if any man have not the *Spirit of Christ*, he is none of his." It must, we think, be admitted, that the *Spirit of God*, in the first verse, is the same with the *Spirit of Christ*, in the last. Now upon the principle, that Christ is truly God, or of the same divine essence with the Father, there appears to be a perfect propriety, in speaking of the Spirit of the one, as the Spirit of the other. Upon this principle, and upon no other, does the Holy Spirit bear the same relation to each. The vision which Isaiah had of God, recorded in the following words, is said, by the Evangelist John, to be a vision of Christ. "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the Temple. Above it stood the seraphim: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, holy, holy, holy is *the Lord of Hosts;* the whole earth is full of his glory." Now we think, that if the true God is any where spoken of in the Bible, it must be admitted, that he is here. But, it is remarkable, John speaks of the glory presented to the vision of the prophet on this occasion, as the glory of Christ. Having quoted a passage from the chapter in which this vision is mentioned, John says, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him." But how could this be the glory of Christ? It must be either because it was the person of Christ, who is here called "the Lord of hosts," whose glory filled the whole earth; or, because Christ is one with the Father, in such a sense, as to render it proper to predicate of the one, the glory of the other. In either case, the Deity of Christ is supported; although we do not hesitate to say, that in our opinion,

the latter hypothesis is the most agreeable to the scriptures. It is on the same ground, that Israel's tempting God, is said to be tempting Christ. In the Old Testament their rebellion against the command of the Lord, is called tempting God. But Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, when referring to the same conduct, calls it tempting Christ. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." There can be no doubt that the Being, against whom the Israelites sinned, in the wilderness, was the true God. And the fact, that their tempting him, is said to be tempting Christ, is an irresistible argument that Christ is the true God; or in other words, that he is one in essence with the Father; so that in general, what is affirmed of the one, may be affirmed of the other. We now leave our readers to judge, whether the doctrine of the Trinity, is in the scriptures, or not. While it is an acknowledged fact, that there is but one God, we find that in the scriptures the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are frequently spoken of as distinct persons; that the names, titles, attributes, works and worship peculiar to God, are ascribed to each. The conclusion is irresistible to our minds; that there are three persons in the one God. This is the most natural construction of the scripture language. Admitting the scriptures to be the word of God, the doctrine of the Trinity, mysterious as it is, appears to be altogether more rational than any hypothesis which denies it.

(To be continued.)

[The Review designed for this number is divided, for want of room.]

Religious Publications.

REV. DANIEL A. CLARK'S SERMONS.

Not long since, a volume of Sermons, written by Rev. Daniel A. Clark, late Pastor of the First Church in Amherst, Mass. came under our eye. They were designed, as the author tells us, to be used at religious meetings, when there is not present a Minister of the Gospel. The Sermons are fourteen in number, and upon the following subjects: The Church safe; The only true God; Unregenerate men without holiness; The Gospel sustains the Law; Correct views of Christ, essential; Christ redeems and sanctifies; Terms of acceptance with God; The man of God distinguished; Sinners made useful to God's people; Wrath conquered by kindness; Gospel truth defined; An honest ministry; The rich believer bountiful; Nothing safe but the Church. We think that the author has been admirably successful in his attempt to fill the "chasm," which he mentions in his preface. No volume, within our knowledge, is better adapted to the design which this publication aims to accomplish, than the one before us. The subjects, as it will be perceived

from the statement given, are all of them important, and treated in a manner which, if not wholly original, is highly interesting.—There is in it something stirring, as well as novel. We present no extracts; for we wish our readers to possess the volume itself, and to be acquainted with its entire contents. The Sermons will not be read without interest, and we should think that they could not be without profit. We hope that the work will receive an extensive patronage.

REV. E. CORNELIUS' SERMON.

THE Sermon to which we refer, was preached by the Rev. ELIAS CORNELIUS, Pastor of the Tabernacle Church, Salem, Mass. on the Doctrine of the Trinity. We notice it on account both of the subject, and of the correct, lucid and able manner in which it is stated and discussed by the author. We took up the Sermon with raised expectations; but they were more than answered by the perusal. The subject is important, and even fundamental, in what we consider to be the gospel scheme. Omitting other remarks, we would observe, that the writer has avoided, if not entirely, yet to a very great extent, a fault, which we have often been pained to see, a loose and careless manner in quoting scripture, in proof of a point upon which it had no direct bearing. He manifests more judgment and caution in his selection of passages to prove what he asserts, than is usual with preachers on subjects of controversy. A judicious and popular Discourse on the Doctrine of the Trinity, was demanded by the existing state of things. We are glad to meet with one which we so highly approve, and can so cordially recommend to our readers. We wish that it may have a general circulation in the christian public.

Religious Intelligence.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY celebrated its tenth anniversary on the 11th of May, in the Middle Dutch Church, New York. In the absence of the venerable President, the Chair was taken by the Hon. John Cotton Smith, one of the Vice-Presidents. The meeting was numerous, and the exercises attended with the usual degree of interest. The following are selected as the most prominent facts in the abstract of the Secretary's Annual Report.

"The receipts into the treasury, and the circulation of the Scriptures, have both again exceeded those of the preceding years; the former by 6576 dollars, and the latter by 3881 Bibles and Testaments.

"During the year there have been printed at the Depository, or are now in the press, 34,250 Bibles; viz. in English, 28,250;

Spanish, 4000; French, 4000; and 46,750 Testaments; viz. in English, 44,750; and in French, 2000; making a total of Bibles and Testaments for the present year of 81,000, which, added to 451,902, the number which was stated in the Ninth Report, makes a grand total of FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND TWO BIBLES AND TESTAMENTS, or parts of the latter, printed from the stereotype plates of the Society, or otherwise obtained for circulation during the ten years of the Society's existence. Plates for a pocket bible have at length been completed, though after some delay, and an edition of 2000 have been put to press.

"The issues from the Depository from the 30th of April, 1825, to the 1st of May 1826, have been as follows:—31,154 bibles; 35,927 testaments; 52 Mohawk Gospels, and 1 Delaware Epistle. Total, 67,134; which added to 372,913 bibles and testaments, and parts of the latter, issued in former years, make the whole number issued from the commencement of the institution to be 440,047—exclusive of those issued by the Kentucky Bible Society, and printed from plates belonging to this Society, and those which have been procured by Auxiliary Societies from other quarters. The issues of the scriptures in foreign languages has been considerably augmented during the past year. The account is as follows:—Spanish bibles, 2,705; French, 203; German, 157; Dutch 1;—3,066. Spanish testaments, 2,681; German, 261; Portugese, 1;—2,943. Total of both, 6,009.

After mentioning supplies furnished by the Society to the West Indies, Sandwich Islands, &c. the report states the following facts concerning our own country. "In Illinois one fourth of the twelve thousand families composing the population of that state, are unsupplied with the Scriptures. In Wayne county, Ohio, the Bible Society reports that 654 families have been found destitute, and five towns remained unexplored: In Brown county, Ohio, 985 families are in a similar condition. The reports of the Bible Society in Scott county, Ken. declares that in one district in that county, out of 559 persons subject to taxation, 260 were found destitute of the Scriptures; in another district 267 out of 400; and in another 327 out of 572. In nine out of the 36 counties of Alabama, the most highly improved parts of the State, 2378 families have been found destitute, while only 2695 families in the same counties were supplied. It is estimated that 7134 families are destitute in the other counties of that State. The Secretary of one of the Societies in Indiana, estimates the number of families in that state at 40,000, not more than one half of which number have an entire copy of the bible.

Many other facts of a similar character might be presented, from other states in the South and West; but the Managers choose rather to turn their attention nearer home, where, within the state of New York, facts have been disclosed equally painful to every Christian heart. In Oswego County, one fourth part of the families are destitute. In nine towns of Livingston county, 277 families are destitute. In Tioga county, 500 families are in the like situation. In Allegany county, and some of the adjoining settlements, 1000 families are destitute. The Society in St

ince county, found 716 fam-
i the like situation, and took
liate measures to supply
These facts have been
d by the Societies, who
taken pattern after the ex-
set them in Monroe county
ear, and they have resolved
severe in their labours, un-
s known that every family
plied. But with all their
, the tide of population rolls
rapidly from the shores of
tlantic to the Rocky Moun-
that the Managers fear that
greater exertions are em-
d, to disseminate the Bible,
will ere long exist in our
ry, millions of civilized hu-
eings unenlightened by the
es of God.
e number of Auxiliary So-
s recognised by the parent
ition during the past year,
-two.

MISSIONS IN CEYLON.

LOUGH, Wesleyan Missionary
ylon, states a very important
hat has lately transpired in the southern part of peninsular India—it is supposed Tanjore, the scene of Mr. Swartz's labors. He states it on the authority of a missionary of the Church of England, who had lately attended a missionary meeting in Ceylon.—It is this: "that forty villages, containing in the aggregate, four thousand inhabitants, had publicly renounced heathenism, and had converted many of their temples into Christian churches, and such as could not be thus used they had demolished, with their idols."

Our correspondent met, at the table of Mr. Butterworth, with a Mr. Bruce, an officer of the East India Company, who had just returned from Madras. Mr. Bruce "spoke of twenty-two gentlemen on the Madras establishment under government, [we presume he means, in the civil service,] who appear to be truly converted to God, and who are acting, in some degree, the part of missionaries among the heathen." He said, also, that forty military officers, in the same Presidency, were like-minded.

Miss. Herald.

Ordinations and Installations.

y 1,—Rev. LUTHER G. BING-
vas installed over the First
ch and Society in Marietta,
Sermon by Rev. Samuel
oge.

y 10,—Rev. LEONARD JOHN-
vas ordained as an Evangelist
eathersfield, Vt. Sermon by
W. Chapin, of Woodstock.

y 10,—Rev. Messrs. M. KING
AMUEL K. SNEED, were ordained at Middletown, Ky. as Evangelists, by the Presbytery of Louisville.

May 14,—Rev. JACOB BROADHEAD, D. D. was installed Pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in New York. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Baldwin, of New-York.

May 17,—Rev. JOSIAH TUCKER was ordained Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Madi-

son, Me. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Thurston, of Winthrop.

May 24,—Rev. DANIEL DANA, D. D. was installed Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church and Society in Newburyport, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Samuel P. Williams.

May 31,—Rev. HENRY WOOD was ordained as Pastor of the Congregational Church in Goffstown, N. H. Sermon by Rev. E. P. Bradford, of New Boston.—At the same time Rev. JACOB LITTLE was ordained as an Evangelist.

June 20,—Rev. AARON PICKET was ordained in South Boston as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Fay, of Charlestown.

June 21,—Rev. SAMUEL RUSSELL was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Boylston. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Nelson, of Leicester.

June 21,—Rev. A. B. CHURCH was ordained at East Machias, Me. as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Jackson, of West Machias.

June 27,—Rev. Mr. FITZ was ordained at Ipswich, as Colleague Pastor with the Rev. Dr. Dana.

July 5,—Rev. THOMAS SAVAGE was installed, at Bedford, N. H. by the Londonderry Presbytery. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Whiton.

July 12,—Rev. HEMAN ROOD was ordained to the Pastoral care of the Gilmanton Central Congregational Society. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Edwards, of Andover, Ms.

Installed, at Bennington, Vt. Rev. DANIEL A. CLARK. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Griffin, President of Williams College.

Poetry.

NIGHT.

Night is the time to muse;
  There, from the eye, the soul
Takes flight; and with expanding views,
  Beyond the starry pole,
Descries athwart the abyss of night,
The dawn of uncreated light.

Night is the time to pray;
  Our Saviour oft withdrew
To desert mountains far away;
  So will his followers do,—
Steal from the throng to haunts untrod,
And hold communion there with God.

Night is the time for death,—
  When all around is peace,
Calmly to yield the weary breath,
  From sin and suffering cease,—
Think of heaven's bliss, and give the sign
To parting friends;—such death be mine!

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"P." and "J. Anona," are received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. SEPTEMBER, 1826. No. 9.

For the Christian Magazine.

Review.

UNITARIANISM SOUND DOCTRINE.—*A Sermon preached at Waltham, at the Ordination of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, Feb. 15, 1826. By Nathaniel Whitman, Minister of Billerica.*

[Continued from page 262.]

We are now prepared to notice Mr. W.'s second objection to the doctrine of the Trinity. "We object to this doctrine still further, that it tends in its legitimate consequences, to the destruction of Revelation. Of these consequences, it may be sufficient, for my present purpose, to mention only one. But this is of such a character, that it must, it would seem, when duly considered by Trinitarians, excite in their minds, a fearful distrust of the soundness of the doctrine whence it necessarily flows. The consequence of which I thus speak, is the denial of the Supreme Deity of our heavenly Father. Trinitarians cannot, in consistency with their creed, admit that the Father is the only true God. If the three persons in the Godhead are the same in substance, equal in power, and glory, then must each of them be a Supreme Being, or neither of them alone can be such a Being. But Trinitarians do not allow that there are three Supreme Beings. They must, therefore, to be consistent, deny that the Father is such a Being. And, it would seem, that they do not hesitate to admit that such a consequence does flow from their system. 'For,' say they, 'though the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; yet there are not three Gods, but one God.' *Thus explicitly do they admit, that their doctrine of the Trinity requires them to deny the Supreme Deity of our Heavenly Father.*" This last sentence is truly remarkable. Nor is the one just above, less so; in which he says, that Trinitarians do not hesitate to admit that it does flow from their system, that the Father is not the Supreme Being. Why Mr. W. should say that Trinitarians admit that their system requires them to deny the Supreme Deity of our Heavenly Father, we cannot conceive, unless he meant to say any thing respecting them, which he thought would be to his purpose, whether truth would bear him out in his assertions, or not. There is nothing in his quotation from Vincent, which *implies* that the Father is not the Supreme God; and if there was, Mr. W. knows perfectly well, that Vincent did

not admit this consequence. Mr. W. has a right to say, if he believes so, that the doctrine of the Trinity is inconsistent with the Supreme Deity of the Father. But he has no right to say, that Trinitarians do not hesitate to admit this consequence; for this is a palpable falsehood. It is explicitly contradicted, by nearly every work that has ever been written in favour of the Trinity. We do not believe that Mr. W. ever knew this consequence to be admitted by *any* respectable Trinitarian; either in his writings, preaching, or conversation. If he has, let him name his author.

But, Mr. W. appears to think, that he has proved, that the doctrine of the Trinity *is* inconsistent with the Supreme Deity of the Father. He says, in the passage above quoted, "If the three persons in the Godhead are the same in substance, equal in power and glory, then must each of them be a Supreme Being, or neither of them alone can be such a Being. But Trinitarians do not allow, that there are three Supreme Beings. They must, therefore, to be consistent, deny that the Father is such a Being." We are not certain, that all of our readers will, at first sight, perceive the fallacy of this reasoning. But, in order to do this, they have only to consider that it assumes a principle which is not true. It assumes, that neither the Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, can be a Supreme Being, unless he is so, separate from the other two. But, the doctrine of the Trinity is, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, although personally distinct, are in essence one. Each of them is God, but not separate from the other. Mr. W. says, "Neither of them alone can be such a Being," that is, a Supreme Being. But, the fact is, neither of them *is* alone. There is a sense in which they are not, and cannot be separate. They are one. And if there is a sense in which they are one, then there is a sense in which what is true of them united, is true of each. They are in union the Supreme God. Each of them, therefore, being in essence one with the others, is truly God.

If Mr. W. will attentively consider the natural consequence of denying the Deity of Christ in opposition to all the scriptural testimony in its favour, he may perhaps perceive, that his own sentiments tend much more directly to the destruction of revelation, than those of Trinitarians. His own sentiments, if followed out in all their consequences, would, in our view, lead him to a denial of the Deity of the Father. The language of scripture respecting the Deity of Christ, is essentially the same with that respecting the Deity of the Father. The same names, the same attributes, the same works, and the same worship, are ascribed to the one, that are ascribed to the other. Now if Unitarians can believe that Christ is a mere creature, in opposition to these facts, we see not why, if they would be consistent, they might not deny the Deity of the Father. Let the passages of scripture, which relate to the Deity of the Father, be put to the same torture, which those are obliged to undergo that are thought to support the Deity of the Son, and there would be no difficulty in rendering the testimony of the former, as doubtful as that of the latter. Besides, let the evidence of Christ be set aside, and the works of creation can no longer prove the exist-

ence of God. The works of creation are an evidence of the existence of no higher Being than their Creator. But Christ is the Creator of the world. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made." If, then, the denial of the Deity of the Father, tends to the destruction of revelation, Mr. W. has reason to tremble at the consequences of his own scheme, rather than that of Trinitarians. We would here appeal to the judgment of our readers, whether those who are led, in consequence of their rigid adherence to the most obvious import of the scriptures, to embrace a doctrine as mysterious as that of the Trinity, are more likely to renounce their authority, than those who are willing to admit the truth of nothing which they cannot comprehend, and who, for the sake of making the scriptures speak a language correspondent to their preconceived opinions, put a forced and unnatural construction upon them? We ask Mr. W. himself, whether he believes, that Trinitarians, as a body, have less deference for the scriptures, or less confidence in them, than Unitarians? He will not say this. On the other hand, we believe that he must admit, with us, that Trinitarians generally have higher views of the inspiration of the scriptures, and receive their declarations upon all matters of faith and practice, with a more unwavering confidence, than Unitarians generally. We doubt not, many Unitarians believe in the inspiration of the scriptures, and we know that some of them have ably defended christianity from the attacks of infidels. But, it is a fact, which in our minds admits not of a doubt, that Unitarianism, as it has been defended by some of its ablest advocates, bears a very striking affinity to Deism: many of the most prominent features of each are the same, and the one has a most direct and powerful tendency to the other. Neither Dr. Priestley, nor Mr. Lindsay, nor Mr. Belsham, all of whom have held a high rank among Unitarians, appear to believe in the inspiration of the scriptures. "That the books of scripture," says Dr. Priestley, "were written by particular divine inspiration, is a thing to which the writers themselves make no pretension. It is a notion destitute of all proof, and that has done great injury to christianity." Again he says, "The writers of the books of scripture were *men*, and therefore *fallible;* but all we have to do with them is in the character of *historians* and *witnesses* of what they heard and saw. Of course their credibility is to be estimated like that of other historians." In a letter from Dr. Priestley, to Mr. Lindsay, containing remarks upon a letter which the former had received from Mr. Jefferson, there is an implicit acknowledgment, that their principles were at least bordering upon infidelity. Speaking of Mr. Jefferson, Dr. Priestley says, "He is generally considered an unbeliever; if so, however, *he cannot be far from us*, and I hope in the way to be not only almost, but altogether what we are." Mr. Belsham's views of the scriptures do not appear to differ essentially from Dr. Priestley's. "The scriptures," he says, "contain a faithful account of the *christian doctrine*, which is the *true word of God;* but they are not *themselves* the word of God, nor do they ever assume that title; and it is highly improper to speak of them

as such, as it leads inattentive readers to suppose that they were written under a plenary inspiration, to which they make no pretensions, and as such expressions expose christianity unnecessarily to the cavils of unbelievers." The language of Engedin, Gagneius, Steinbart, and Sembler, with a host of others among the advocates of Unitarianism, is still more disrespectful to the writings of the sacred penmen, and more strongly indicative of real infidelity. Although we feel no disposition to intimate, that all Unitarians have the same views of the scriptures, as those expressed above; yet we do believe that not a few, even in this country, are now on essentially the same ground; and we cannot entertain a doubt that the principles adopted by others, to explain away the obvious import of the numerous passages of scripture, which are thought to teach the doctrine of the Trinity, followed out in their legitimate consequences, would lead directly to the same result. The only reason why any Unitarian stops short of downright infidelity, is, because he does not see, or dares not approach the point, to which his own principles direct him. We take the liberty, therefore, to adopt the language of Mr. W. and to say, "We object to" *Unitarianism*, "because it tends in its legitimate consequences to the destruction of revelation."

But Mr. W. pretends to support Unitarianism by the direct testimony of scripture. In the following passage, he says there is a concise, but complete description of Unitarianism. "And this is life eternal; that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." From the circumstance that the Son here addresses the Father, and calls him the only true God, Mr. W. thinks it a clear case that the Son is a distinct being from the Father, and that the Father alone is God. But here we would ask Mr. W. whether the fact that the Father once said to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is a sceptre of thy kingdom," proves that the Son is God, and that the Father is a distinct and inferior being? If not, we ask, why? The Son is as expressly called God, in the last passage, as the Father is in the first. Again we ask Mr. Whitman, what is the difference between his reasoning from this passage, and that of a person who should attempt to prove, by quoting the following passages, that there is but one God, and he the Son. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for evermore;" or as it might be rendered, who is the Supreme God, blessed for evermore." "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the true God, and eternal life.*" Now we repeat the question, why do not these passages, in which the Son is called the Supreme God, or "over all God," and "the true God," and "eternal life," prove as clearly, and on the same principles, that the Son is the true God, separate from the Father, as the passage quoted by Mr. W. does, that the Father is God, separate from the Son? The circumstance that the adverb only is found in the one quoted by Mr. W. will give it no advantage, if

it is considered, that there can be but one true God. We believe that our readers will perceive that the argument in these two cases is the same. But what, we ask, is that mode of reasoning, or of interpreting scripture, worth, which proves with equal clearness two propositions, which are inconsistent with each other? The fact is, the passages are numerous which assert that the Father is God, and that the Son is God, and that the Holy Ghost is God. But, with all who would understand the scriptures, and not set one passage against another, the question is, how can these be reconciled? Now the doctrine of the Trinity, which admits of three persons in one God, renders them perfectly harmonious. According to this doctrine, the Father may be said to be the only true God, considered in union with the Son and Holy Ghost. And the Son may be said to be the true God considered in union with the Father and the Holy Ghost. And the Holy Ghost may be said to be the true God, and the only true God, considered in union with the Father and the Son. If there is a sense, in which these persons are all one, then we can conceive, that there is a sense, in which each of them is the true God, without supposing that there are three Gods.

The passage which Mr. Whitman considers "another concise, but complete description of Unitarianism," is no more to his purpose, than the one already considered. It is the following. "We know that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth; (as there be gods many, and lords many;) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." We agree with Mr. W. that this passage "is plain to the attentive and unprejudiced mind." Paul is here contrasting the true God with the gods of the heathen, and not with Jesus Christ. It is evident, from the connexion and design of the passage, as well as from the manner in which he has expressed himself, that the Lord Jesus Christ is included in the one God, who is to be worshipped in opposition to the gods of the heathen. This is only one among many instances, in which, as has been shown, Christ is associated with the Father, as an object of religious homage.

Mr. W. supposes that Trinitarians, in order to rid themselves of the argument which he derives from the first of the passages which he quotes in favour of Unitarianism, will resort to the hypothesis, that Christ bears witness to the truth in a two fold capacity. He represents them as supposing, that Christ bears witness to the truth, sometimes in his human, and sometimes in his divine nature. He says, "they," that is, "Trinitarians," gave themselves up to "reasoning pride." "They hence came at length to the determination, that the Son of God must be God himself, or he could not make adequate atonement for the sins of the world. But how was this supposition of human wisdom to be reconciled with the opposing testimony of Jesus? Here was indeed a difficulty. *It was attempted to be surmounted by the hypothesis of two natures in Christ, in consequence of which he might be supposed capable of bearing a two-fold testimony to the truth.*"

Here, we confess, is something new! We do not know that we shall not expose our ignorance; but we are willing to say, we never heard any thing like this before. We never knew that there were any Trinitarians, that attempted to solve the difficulties attending their scheme, by supposing, that Christ sometimes testified to the truth in his divine, and sometimes in his human nature. While we just remind Mr. W. that he is a little too fast in charging this hypothesis upon the whole body of Trinitarians, three quarters of whom, we presume, are as ignorant of it as ourselves, we will thank him to inform us where he found it. As this hypothesis of Christ's bearing testimony to the truth in two natures, is new to us, and as we feel no responsibility for its consequences, good or bad, we shall pass over all that is said in the sermon respecting it. We have, however, a word to say respecting the *fact*, that there are two natures in Christ. Although we never thought of explaining any passage of scripture by the hypothesis, that Christ bears testimony to the truth in two natures; yet we have long believed the fact that a divine and human nature are united in his person, and that it is in view of this fact only, that many passages of scripture can be explained. John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." Now it appears to us, that the doctrine of a divine and human nature, is clearly taught in these words. If the Word was God, he must have been divine. If he was made flesh, he must have taken upon him human nature. Or at least, there is no other intelligible meaning, which we can affix to this declaration. If Mr. W. feels disposed to smile at the hypothesis of two natures in Christ, or again to charge it with a tendency to subvert the gospel, let him tell us in what sense he was *before* Abraham, and yet the *Son* of Abraham; in what sense he is David's *Lord*, and David's *Son*; in what sense he is the *root* and the *offspring* of David? Let Mr. W. tell us, also, what we are to understand by Christ's being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, if he had not a divine nature, and at the same time, show us how he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, without a human nature. Let him in short give us a satisfactory reason why he is so often called God, and why he is so often called man; and how he actually displayed all the divine perfections, at the same time he manifested, with the exception of sin, all the appearances of a man. Until Mr. W. or some other person, can give us a more satisfactory explanation of these things, than we have ever yet seen given upon Unitarian principles, we shall believe that the denial of the doctrine of two natures in Christ, instead of the admission of it, "shakes to its centre the whole Christian fabric."

Mr. W. has attempted to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity had its origin at the beginning of the fourth century; with a view, no doubt, to make it appear, if possible, a doctrine of human invention. But in his zeal to establish this point, he has grossly misrepresented Mosheim, and made him contradict, not only the testimony of other Ecclesiastical historians, but his own.

This he has done by quoting such a part of a paragraph as might, by itself, be construed to favour his cause, and leaving out the rest; while he gives no intimation, not even by a dash, that he has made any omission. The following is the quotation as it stands in Mr. W.'s sermon. "'In the year 317,' says Mosheim, 'a new contention arose in Egypt. Its subject was the doctrine of three persons in one Godhead; a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries, had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. Nothing was dictated to the faith of christians in this matter; nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery.'" We will now give our readers the passage as it stands in the history, designating by italics the parts which are omitted. "In the year 317, a new contention arose in Egypt, *upon a subject of much higher importance, and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature.* The subject *of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable divisions throughout the christian world,* was the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead; a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined, and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. *The church indeed had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from them both; or as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of that distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, and with respect to which the church had consequently, observed a profound silence.* Nothing was dictated to the faith of christians in this matter; nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery." To the first and second of these omissions, we know not that any important objection ought to be made, as they appear to have been designed merely to abridge the passage. But the last obscures the sense of the whole passage. From that part which *is* quoted, a superficial reader, or hearer, might understand, that the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown until the period mentioned. Mr. W. evidently meant that this should be understood, and quoted this part of the passage in Mosheim, for the purpose of making such an impression; as is evident from the circumstance, that he introduces the passage with an intimation that the doctrine "was *made*" at that time, and follows this, and another appended to it, taken from another part of the history, with these words. "It thus appears that during the three first centuries, the purest and brightest period of the Church's history, the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown; and that the Bible without it was found to be sufficiently plain, consistent, and powerful for all the purposes of holy living." Now if the reader will look back, and consider attentively the passage omitted, he will see, that Mosheim has in this, given his decided testimony that the doctrine of the Trinity was known and believed before this period. He

will also perceive, in the words of the historian, a plain and unequivocal intimation that the church, as a body, believed it, and for aught that appears to the contrary, had always believed it. "The church," he says, "indeed had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father, and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from them both; or *as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity.*" Now we ask, how could Mr. W. with this passage before his eyes, say that during the three first centuries, the doctrine of the Trinity "was unknown." Or rather, with this declaration of Mosheim before him, how could he attempt to make his hearers and readers believe, that *this Author*, taught that the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown in the three first centuries? Was the decision of the church, frequently made against Sabellians and others, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity, any thing less than an expression of her belief in the Trinity? What if no form of speech upon this subject had then been prescribed by the church? What, if they had not attempted to explain "the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the distinction which subsists between them," (an attempt which Trinitarians now unite in reprobating,) does not the historian, with the same breath by which he gives us this information, tell us that they had not "hitherto been disputed"? Who at the present day, does not know that a doctrine may be fully, and generally believed, without an universal agreement, in regard to the terms, by which it may be the most advantageously expressed? We do not suppose, that before the Council of Nice, and of Constantinople, there was the same uniformity of expression on this subject, in the church, which existed afterwards. But that the doctrine of the Trinity was the general belief of the church, up to the days of the Apostles, is a fact well supported by the testimony of Ecclesiastical history. There is nothing in the passage from Mosheim, as *quoted by Mr. W.* that disproves this. It does not say that a new doctrine was then introduced into the church; but that a new contention arose respecting one, "which had hitherto escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined, and undetermined by any particular set of ideas." Now what is here said of the doctrine, plainly supposes that it was in existence. Its having escaped vain curiosity, and its being left undefined, and undetermined by any particular set of ideas, irresistibly imply that it was known, and received with little or no dispute. "There were no modes of expression prescribed in speaking of this mystery." But what propriety in saying this, if the mysterious doctrine had not been known? Was it to be expected that modes of expression would be prescribed for a doctrine which had no existence? Had Mr. W. therefore, been totally ignorant of the passage, which he has omitted, he might have seen, that the testimony of Mosheim, is opposite to what he has asserted. But why did he omit this passage? Our readers must settle this question for themselves, or Mr. W. must inform them. We will not, however, affect a degree of candour on this subject which we do not feel. We own that we are totally

unable to make an apology for such gross deception. Although we are unwilling to believe, much less to say, that he designed to conceal the truth, yet the circumstances of this misrepresentation are such, that we cannot suppress the fear that he intended to make the historian speak a language contrary to his meaning. We know this is a serious charge, and we wish we might have occasion to retract it. But we do not feel ourselves at liberty to express a conviction of the purity of a man's motives, when every circumstance attending his conduct, is indicative of a design to deceive.

But we return to the reasoning of Mr. W. He attempts to show, that Unitarianism is supported not only by the passages of scripture which he has quoted, but, to use his own words, "by that analogical language which is selected to pourtray in alluring colours the genius of the christian dispensation." We have, however, repeatedly looked through this passage of the Sermon, and can find no language quoted from the Bible, which is not easily reconciled with the views of the most rigid Trinitarian. That there is a sense in which God is the Father of all mankind, is readily admitted. That there is a sense in which he is the Father of Christ, is also admitted. We have not only the fact that Christ is the Son of God, but the reason why he is thus called. It is on account of his miraculous conception. This seems to be placed beyond a doubt, by the words of the angel to Mary. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*." We believe, as well as Mr. W., that "God is reconciling the world to himself by Jesus Christ." But does the fact that Christ, having taken upon himself "the form of a servant," now acts as an ambassador under the Father, prove that he is by nature inferior to him? Do we infer, that an ambassador to a foreign court is naturally inferior to the prince by whom he is sent, merely because he performs an office under him? Certainly not. Although subordinate in office, he may be equal, and even superior by nature. That Christ is subordinate to the Father in the office which he sustains in the great work of redemption, all Trinitarians readily admit.

Another argument in favor of Unitarianism, Mr. Whitman derives "from the duties which become it." "These," he says, "are the precise duties which are enjoined in the scriptures." He names a number of them particularly, and endeavours to show that these are becoming the Unitarian system only. He begins with faith. "The faith," he says, "which the scriptures require us to exercise towards God, and towards Christ, differs in its essential properties. We are required to believe in God the Father as the Supreme Being; in Christ as the Son of the Father; in God the Father as reconciling the world to himself by Jesus Christ; in Christ as executing this scheme of reconciliation in the character of God's plenipotentiary." To this we reply, we are as truly required to believe in Christ the Son as the Supreme Being, as we are to believe in the Father as the Supreme Being. We are required to believe in each, according to the character given of him in the holy scriptures; and

there we find that Christ the Son, as well as the Father, is called the Supreme God. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, *who is over all, God* blessed forever." And if it is true, as we have attempted to show, that the Father, and the Son in his Divine nature, are in essence one, while they are personally distinct, there is no falsehood, or impropriety, in speaking of each as the Supreme God. But Mr. W. says, we are required to believe in Christ as the Son of the Father. This is true; and there is no inconsistency between the belief of this, and the belief that he is truly God, if we receive the declaration of John, that "the Word who was in the beginning with God, and who was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us." Nor does the belief that "God is reconciling the world to himself by Jesus Christ," necessarily preclude the belief that he is in his highest nature truly Divine. It only makes it necessary that we should believe, that "God was manifested in the flesh;" or that he who was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, took upon him the form of a servant." Mr. W. can derive no argument against the Deity of Jesus Christ, from any passage in which he is mentioned as acting under the Father, or being less than the Father, unless he entirely overlooks or rejects the truth, that he has voluntarily consented to act a subordinate part in the work of redemption. Only let what is insisted upon by all intelligent Trinitarians be admitted, viz. that the second Person in the Godhead consented to act the part of a Mediator between God and man, and to accomplish this work, took upon himself human nature, and it is very easy to understand those passages which speak of his inferiority to the Father, in perfect consistency with his original equality. They all have reference to him in his *official* character, in which Trinitarians as well as Unitarians admit that he is subordinate to the Father.

Mr. W. brings into view the duty of repentance, love to God, obedience to Christ, and his own example in worshipping the Father, to prove, that the Father only is the true God. He says, "It is worthy of remembrance, that in calling sinners to repentance, Jesus never calls them to the performance of this duty towards himself, but always towards the Father." And what if he does? The Father is by office the Lawgiver, and the Son by office the Mediator. This is a sufficient reason why repentance should be spoken of as more immediately respecting the Father than the Son. And we have already repeatedly had occasion to remark, that the circumstance of Christ's voluntarily undertaking the office of Mediator between God and men, no more proves his original inferiority to the Father, than the office of an ambassador among men, proves his native inferiority to the prince who sends him. But after all, the Father is not in the scriptures made so exclusively the object of repentance, as Mr. W. represents. He says, that "repentance is always mentioned as having relation only to the Father," as tho' the Father was by name always distinctly mentioned as its exclusive object. But this is not true. The Father is no where, as we recollect, mentioned by *name*, as the object of repentance, in distinction from the other Divine

persons. In most instances, repentance is inculcated without naming distinctively the person who is the object of it. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." There is one* passage in which *God* is mentioned as the object of repentance, and Christ the object of faith. But upon this it ought to be observed, that the term *God*, is not always exactly synonymous with *Father*. It is sometimes used to denote the Godhead generally, without any particular reference to the distinction of persons. This may be its import in the passage to which we allude. Besides, if it be allowed that the term God, in this passage, means the Father, in distinction from the Son, it would no more prove that he *only* is the object of repentance, than the circumstance that the Lord Jesus Christ is mentioned as the object of faith, proves that he only is the object of faith.

Mr. W. says, that "the love which we are required to exercise towards God (the Father) and towards Christ, are required of us for different reasons and with a view to different ends." Very well. This to a certain extent is true. If the Father and the Son are distinct persons in the one God, and perform distinct parts in the work of redemption, there is ground for the exercise of love towards them for different reasons. But Mr. W. says, "we are required to love God as supreme, underived, and infinite perfection." To this it is replied, we are no more required to love God the Father as supreme, underived, and infinite perfection, than we are Christ the Son. We have already shown that all these attributes are ascribed to him as well as to the Father.

Mr. W. admits that "we are required to be obedient to Christ in all things;" but endeavours to avoid the conclusion from this that he is God, by saying, "It is the Father who requires this obedience." But we reply, Christ himself requires this. Besides, if the fact, that the Father requires mankind to be obedient to Christ, proves that Christ is not truly God, we ask why the fact that Christ requires them to be obedient to the Father, does not prove that the Father is not God?

The example of Christ in worshipping the Father only, is brought by Mr. W. to prove, that we ought to worship the Father only, and that by consequence the Father only is God. In reply to all this, we would ask him, whether he really thinks Christ would have worshipped himself, if he had been God? If not, the circumstance that he did not worship himself, cannot prove, that he is not God. We are required to imitate the example of God the Father, as well as that of Christ. "Be ye followers of God, as dear children." But will Mr. W. admit that we ought not to worship the Father, because he does not worship himself? Or does he think it sound reasoning to infer, that he is not truly God, from the fact that he does not worship himself? If not, we think that he must himself perceive, that his argument against the Deity of Christ, from the fact that he did not worship himself, is nothing more or less than specious trifling.

Our readers have now an opportunity to see to what Mr. W.'s argument, from the agreement of the duties of the gospel with Uni-

* Acts, xx. 21. "Testifying both to the Jews and the Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

tarianism, amounts. They may perhaps think with us, that these agree quite as well with Trinitarianism. After all the ingenuity and logic which he has displayed in his attempt to prove, that Christ is not an object of religious worship, they will doubtless remember, that the ordinance of baptism is required to be administered in his name in the same manner, in which it is administered in the name of the Father; that in the apostolic benediction, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ is implored in language equally expressive of supreme homage to him, as that in which the love of God the Father is sought, is of supreme homage to him; that the distinctive appellation of the primitive christians was, "*those that call on the name of the Lord Jesus;*" that the prayer of the dying martyr Stephen was, "*Lord Jesus receive my spirit;*" that God the Father himself has said, "*Let all the angels of God worship him;*" and that the inhabitants of heaven have actually been heard to say, "*Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto* HIM *that sitteth on the throne and to the* LAMB, *forever and ever.*" When Mr. W. will reconcile the duties here enjoined, and exemplified, with the theory and practice of Unitarians, we shall believe that an argument may be drawn from the duties inculcated in the gospel, in favor of Unitarianism. But at present, we must be allowed to consider them as demonstration of its falsehood.

[To be continued.]

TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY FATHERS IN FAVOR OF THE TRINITY, AND THE PROPER DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

BARNABAS, sometimes called the Apostle, who was probably born before the crucifixion of the Saviour, and who wrote soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, by Titus, is a very decisive witness in favor of the Divinity of Christ. In the fifth section of his Catholic Epistle, he says, "The Lord was content to suffer for our souls, although He be the Lord of the whole earth; to whom God said before the beginning of the world, Let us make man after our own image and likeness." Again, in the seventh section he says, "If therefore the Son of God, who is Lord of all, and shall come to judge both the quick and the dead, hath suffered, that by his stripes we might live, let us believe that the Son of God could not have suffered but for us." Surely he who is Lord of the whole earth—Lord of all—and who will judge the quick and dead, can be no other than a Divine Person.

Clemens Romanus was probably born before the middle, and wrote towards the close of the first century. As is generally supposed, he was personally acquainted with most of the Apostles, and seems to have been the same person whom Saint Paul speaks of as his fellow laborer. All the writings of this Father which have reached us, are comprised in a few pages. In these, though he no where treats formally or professedly on the subject in hand, he incidentally expresses himself in the following manner;—"For Christ is theirs who are humble, and who do not

exalt themselves over his flock. The sceptre of the Majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the show of pride and arrogance; though He could have done so; but with humility, as the Holy Ghost had before spoken concerning him." And again —"God is good to all, especially to those who flee to his mercy through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and majesty forever and ever. Amen."

Polycarp, who flourished in the beginning of the second century, and who suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Marcus Antonius, about A. D. 167, in a short Epistle to the Phillippians, the only writing of his which is now extant, writes thus. "Mercy and peace unto you, from God Almighty, and the Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour, be multiplied.—Every living creature shall worship Christ.—Now the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he himself who is our everlasting High Priest, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, build you up in faith and truth, and in all meekness and gentleness, and grant unto you a lot and portion among his saints!—God is good to all, especially to those who flee to his mercy through our Lord Jesus Christ; to whom be glory and majesty forever and ever. Amen!"

The next witness whom I shall adduce is Ignatius, who suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Trajan, A. D. 107. In his Epistles the following passages occur.*

The salutation of his Epistle to the Ephesians is in these words —"Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Ephesus in Asia, most deservedly happy; being blessed through the greatness and fullness of God the Father, and predestinated before the world began, that it should be always unto an enduring and unchangeable glory; being united and chosen through his true passion, according to the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God; all happiness, by Jesus Christ, and his undefiled grace." In the 7th section of the same Epistle, he says, "There is one Physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God Incarnate." And again, in the 19th section— "Ignorance was taken away, and the old kingdom abolished, God himself appearing in the form of a man."

Toward the close of his Epistle to the Magnesians, he expresses himself thus—"Study therefore to be confirmed in the doctrine of our Lord, and of his Apostles; that whatsoever ye may do, ye may prosper, both in body and spirit; in faith and charity; in the Son, and in the Father, and in the Holy Spirit."

He begins his Epistle to the Smyrneans thus—"I glorify God even Jesus Christ, who has given you such wisdom." And in the close of his Epistle to Polycarp, he says, "I wish you all happiness in Jesus Christ our God."

All the witnesses whom I have yet cited, lived in the first centu-

* The author is aware that the authenticity of the Epistles of Ignatius, has been called in question, as well as that of Barnabas, before quoted. It is impossible in a work written on the plan and with the design of these Letters, to enter into the merits of controversies of this sort. It is sufficient for his purpose to say, that the great body of learned men consider the Epistle of Barnabas, and the smaller Epistles of Ignatius, (and from these alone he offers quotations) as, in the main, the real works of the writers whose names they bear. Of this opinion was the eminently learned Unitarian Dr. Lardner.

ry, and were personally acquainted with some of the Apostles. Their testimony, therefore, is weighty, and worthy of peculiar attention.

Irenæus, who was a disciple of Polycarp, and who is said to have suffered martyrdom about A. D. 202, is an important and decisive witness on the subject before us. In the fourth book of his work against the Heretics, he begins by asserting that "God was made man." In the second book of that work, and toward the close of the thirteenth chapter, he says, "The Son from eternity coexisted with the Father, and from the beginning he always revealed the Father to angels and archangels, and principalities and powers, and to all to whom it pleased him to reveal Him."

About the same time with Irenæus, lived Theophilus, Bishop of the church of Antioch. He expressly acknowledges "Christ to be God," and says, "the world was made by him: for when the Father said, 'Let us make man in our image after our likeness,' He spake to no other but to his own Word, and his own Wisdom, that is to the Son and the Holy Spirit."—These he expressly styles a Trinity in the Godhead.

Justin Martyr, who about A. D. 165, sealed his faith with his blood, as the latter part of his name signifies, affords important and decisive testimony on this subject. In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, the latter is represented as finding fault with Christians for maintaining the Deity and worship of Christ. "To me it appears," says Trypho, "a paradox, incapable of any sound proof, to say that this Christ was God before all time, and that then he was made man and suffered; and to assert that he was any thing more than a man of men, appears not only paradoxical but foolish." "I know," replies Justin, "that it appears paradoxical and particularly to those of your nation, who are determined neither to know nor to do the will of God, but to follow the inventions of your teachers, as God declares of you. However, if I could not demonstrate that He existed before all time, being God, the Son of the Maker of the Universe, and was made man of the Virgin; yet as this personage was shown by every sort of proof to be the Christ of God, be the question as it may respecting his Divinity and humanity, you have no right to deny that He is the Christ of God, even if he were only a mere man; you could only say that I was mistaken in my idea of his character. For there are some who call themselves Christians, who confess him to be the Christ, but only a mere man; with whom neither I, nor the most that bear that name, agree; because we are commanded by Christ himself, not to obey the precepts of men, but his own injunctions, and those of the holy prophets." In another part of the same Dialogue, he speaks of Christ as the "God of Israel who was with Moses."

In the first Apology, he expresses himself thus—"We worship and adore the Father and that Son who came from him, and the Spirit of Prophecy, honoring them in word and in truth. Those who say that the Son is the Father, are convicted of being ignorant of the Father, and of not knowing that the Father of all hath a Son, who being the first begotten Word of God, is also God."

In his second apology he speaks

—"We worship and love the
of the Unbegotten and In-
e God, who is with God, be-
for our sakes he became
that being also a partaker
ır sufferings, He might ac-
lish our cure."

the writings of Melito, Pas-
the church of Sardis, who
ıhed about A. D. 170, only
fragments remain, as pre-
d by Eusebius, Anastasius,
ıthers. In one of these
ents, he speaks thus. "We
ıot worshippers of stones;
ve are worshippers of the
lod, who is before all, and
and in his Christ, who is
God, the Eternal Word."—
ıther, he expresses himself
is pointed manner. After
; that it was unnecessary to
further proofs of Christ's
nity, he adds, "the miracles
: He wrought after his bap-
most forcibly demonstrate
ınfirm his Divinity conceal-
Flesh. Thus being at once
:t God and Perfect Man, he
ered his two natures to us
Divinity, by the miracles
he performed in the three
after his baptism—his hu-
y, by the thirty antecedent
, in which the meanness of
esh hid the tokens of his
ity, though he was True
verlasting God."

e following testimony of
ıagoras, who flourished a-
A. D. 175, is very express
ınted. "The Son of God
: Word of the Father, in
r and energy; by him and
gh him were all things cre-
The Father and the Son
ne. If you desire a further
nation of the meaning of
ı this point, I will endeavor
ve you a brief one. He is
irst-Born of the Father but
ever beginning to exist—
who is not filled with admiration," says he, "that we who declare God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Spirit, showing both the power of their Unity, and the distinction of their order, should be called perverse Atheists?—We are not Atheists, who reckon as God, the Maker of the Universe, and his Word who proceedeth from him."

Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, in reply to the accusations of the heathen, says, "We do not, O Grecians, act the part of fools, nor do we tell you idle stories, when we declare that God was born in the human form."

Contemporary with Athenagoras, was Clemens Alexandrinus, whose testimony is no less explicit on the subject under consideration. In his Pædagogue, book first, chapter second, he says, "O children, our Master is like to God his Father, whose Son He is, without sin. He is God in the form of Man, immaculate."

Again, in the third book, and twelfth chapter, of the same work, he thus exhorts—"Let us give thanks to the only Father and Son; to the Son and the Father; to the Son our Teacher and Master, with the Holy Spirit; one in all respects; in whom are all things; by whom all things are one; by whom is eternal existence; whose members we are; whose is the glory and the ages; who is the perfect good, the perfect beauty, all wise and all just, to whom be glory both now and ever. Amen." And a little after in the same work, he pours out the following exhortation—"Gather together thy simple children, to praise in a holy manner, to celebrate without guile, Christ the Leader of children, the eternal Logos, the infinite Age, the eternal Light, the Fountain of

Mercy, &c.—Filled with the dew of the Spirit, let us sing together sincere praises, genuine hymns, to Chirst our King!" The same writer, in his Exhortation to the Gentiles, styles Christ, The Living God, who was then worshipped and adored. "Believe," says he, "O man, in Him who is both Man and God; believe, O man, in Him who suffered death, and yet is adored as the Living God."

The testimony of the eloquent Tertullian, who flourished about A. D. 200, on this subject, is as direct, and indubitable, as can well be imagined. Those who read his treatise against Praxeas, will no longer have any remaining doubt. Praxeas was a Heretic, who taught that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were one and the same; in other words, he denied all distinction of Persons in the Godhead, maintaining the same error which was afterwards revived, and has been since generally known, under the name of Sabellianism. Tertullian entered the lists against him, and wrote a treatise, in which, with great decision and force, he supported what were then, and have ever since been considered, as the Orthodox opinions on this subject. In this treatise he speaks pointedly and clearly of the Trinity in Unity; of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet one God; he speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ as both God and man, as Son of man and Son of God, and called Jesus Christ. He speaks also of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And he explicitly declares, not only that he and those around him received this faith; but that it had obtained from the beginning, antecedently to any former heretics; and much more antecedently to Praxeas, who was of yesterday. The following is a small specimen of his language. "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and every one of them is God. The name of the Father is God Almighty, the Most High, Lord of Hosts, &c. These names belong to the Son likewise."

Origen, who flourished about A. D. 230, and who undoubtedly was the most learned and able divine of his day, thus expresses himself on the subject now under consideration—"When you confess one God, and assert in the same confession, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are One God, how perplexed, how difficult, how inextricable does this seem to the unbelieving. And again, when you say that the Lord of Glory was crucified, and that it was the Son of man who descended from heaven, 'how perplexed,' cries he who hears, but hears not with faith; how difficult do these things appear! Because they are themselves in an error. But do thou hold fast, nor entertain a doubt concerning this faith, knowing that God hath showed this way of faith unto thee." And again; "There are some indeed who make a declaration concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but not in sincerity nor in truth. Such are all Heretics who indeed profess the Father, and Son and Spirit, but not in a right and believing manner; for they either separate the Son from the Father, that they may ascribe one nature to the Father, and another to the Son; or they erroneously confound them, by thinking to make of three, a compound God; or by supposing only three different names. But he who rightly

confesses the truth, will indeed ascribe to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, their distinct properties, but confess that there is no difference as to nature or substance."

Cyprian, who was contemporary with Origen, and who, though inferior to him in learning, greatly excelled him in pastoral zeal and fidelity, and in general Orthodoxy, expresses himself on the subject under consideration in a way which cannot be mistaken.

In his work on the Unity of the Church, he speaks thus—"The Lord saith, I and my Father are one; and again, concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, it is written, These Three are One. Whoever does not hold this Unity, does not hold the law of God; does not hold the faith of the Father and of the Son; and does not hold the truth unto salvation."—And again, he says, "Christ was God and man, that he might be the fitter to be the Mediator between them." Again, "This Christ is our God; and being a Mediator between two, he put on the man, that he might lead him to God his Father. Christ became man, that man might become like Christ."

In a Council at Carthage, called to deliberate on the re-baptizing of heretics, and in which Cyprian presided, one of the sentences pronounced was the following—"The Lord Jesus Christ, our God, and the Son of God the Father, hath built his Church on a rock, not on heresy. Wherefore those who are out of the Church, and stand in opposition to Christ, scatter his flock, and cannot be considered as baptized."

Dionysius of Alexandria, was one of the zealous champions for the truth, who opposed the heresy of Paul of Samosata. He is strongly commended by Basil, for always using the following form of doxology—"To God the Father, and the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, be glory and dominion, now and forever, world without end. Amen!"

Novatian, who was contemporary with Cyprian, is one of the most powerful witnesses that could be wished for, on the subject before us. He left a treatise expressly "On the Trinity."

Novatian contends for three Persons in the Godhead, cautioning his readers against Sabellianism, on the one hand, and Tritheism on the other. He maintains the eternal generation of the Son; and that Christ is very God and very man, in the same mysterious and glorious Person. And finally, he maintains the divine personality of the Holy Spirit.

About the time of Novatian, lived Arnabius, a distinguished father of the Church of Africa. This writer brings in the heathen as objecting to the worship of Christ. "Our gods," say they, "are not displeased with you for worshipping the Almighty God; but that you make a God of one that was born a man and put to death by the punishment of the cross, (an infamous punishment, only inflicted on vile persons,) and because you believe him to be still alive, and make daily supplications to him." To this he answers, first, upon their own principles, that admitting it were so, that Christ was only a mere man; yet he might with more reason deserve to be worshipped for his good deeds to mankind, than either their Bacchus, or Ceres, or Æsculapius, or Minerva, or Triptolemus, or Hercules, &c.

Secondly he answers, more closely, that the reason of their worshipping Christ, was the certain knowledge, that he was the True God, whom they could not but worship and honor. He proceeds, "What then? suppose any one, raving should ask, Is Christ God? We will reply, he is God, and God of the inmost powers of the soul."

So much for the direct testimony of the Early Fathers. In the substance of this testimony they all concur. I cannot recollect a single writer, prior to the Council of Nice, who so much as intimates either that he himself denied the divinity of Christ, or the Holy Trinity; or that the Christian Church denied it. The extracts which I have given, are a fair specimen of the manner in which the writers of that period express themselves on the subject, when it comes before them.

An Extract. Dr. Miller.

For the Christian Magazine.

"THE OUTCASTS OF ISRAEL."

It is morally certain, that the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel are now in existence, somewhere, as a distinct people. This appears, from the numerous *predictions* of their future conversion and restoration—some of which will here be cited. "I will bring again the captivity of my people *Israel* and *Judah*, saith the Lord, and I will cause them to *return to the land* that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it." —"Then shall the children of Judah, and the *children of Israel* be gathered together, and appoint themselves *one head*, and they shall come up out of the land."—"Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the *tribes of Israel*, his fellows, and will put them with the stick of *Judah*, and make them *one stick*, and they shall be one in my hand. I will take the *children of Israel* from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and *bring them into their own land*. And I will make them *one nation* with the children of Judah, in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and *one king shall be king to them all;* and they shall be *no more two nations*, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms, any more at all." —These several predictions, with many others of the same import, so far as they have respect to the dispersed descendants of the tribes of Israel, have never yet had the shadow of a fulfilment. They remain, therefore, to be fulfilled." "The outcasts of Israel" shall one day be *converted* and *restored*, and, in conjunction with the converted Jews, shall become a holy people to the Lord. But, if this is true, then *they must still exist, somewhere, as a distinct people.* For if they do not exist, they cannot be converted, and the fulfilment of the Divine predictions respecting them is impossible. Or, if they have become so incorporated with the idolatrous nations of the earth, as to be no longer distinguishable from them, then the fulfilment of these predictions can never be ascertained by *facts.* It never can be known, by facts, whether they are fulfilled or not. We infer therefore, as we think conclusively, from the *predictions* which have respect to the descendants of the tribes of Israel, that they must now be in existence, somewhere, as a distinct people.

But *where* are they? And *who* are they?—These questions, so full of interest and importance,

may not admit of demonstrative answers. They may not admit of answers, which shall at once clear the subject of all remaining doubt or difficulty. Still, I am of opinion that answers may be given to them, which shall be, in a good degree, satisfactory.

The scriptures leave the ten tribes of Israel "in Halah and Habor, by the river Gozen in Media, whither they were carried captive by Shalmanezer, the king of Assyria." This circumstance has led most modern inquirers to seek for the dispersed of Israel in the *interior of Asia*. And by some few inquirers, they have been supposed to be found there. Some have believed the *Afghans of Persia* to be the descendants of the ancient Israelites. But it has appeared, on more diligent examination, that the Afghans are bigoted Mahometans; and that whatever of their traditions might seem, at first, to be derived from the Old Testament, they were more probably derived from their Mahometan books and teachers. Others have regarded the *black Jews of Cochin*, as the existing remnant of the tribes of Israel. But were we to admit these to be Israelites, rather than Jews, (a supposition which is not impossible,) still, they are but a *small part* of the descendants of Israel. They are the descendants, perhaps, of the stragglers who were left behind, when the body of the nation removed to remoter regions.

I have said that the scriptures leave the ten tribes in Media, whither they had been carried captive by the king of Assyria. But although we have no further account of them in the *canonical* books of Scripture, we have in the *apocryphal* books. It is related in Esdras, that after they had dwelt for a time in Media, "they took this counsel among themselves, that *they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a farther country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land.*" This Apocryphal writer proceeds to relate, that they went out of Media, in a northeasterly direction, and pursued a long journey "of a *year and a half.*" (See 2 Esdras, xiii. 40.) Where they stopped, we are not informed; but their journey "of a year and a half," must necessarily carry them to a very great distance.

We have several predictions relative to the *circumstances* of the Israelites, during the period of their dispersion, which will throw some light on the present inquiry. Thus we are told by one of the prophets, that when "the outcasts of Israel" shall be restored, they shall remember the God of their fathers "in *far countries*"—and shall be gathered "from the *west country.*" (Zech. viii. 7. and x. 9.) We may hence conclude, that the place of their present abode is some country far to the west of Palestine.—Another tells us, that during their dispersion, "the Lord will feed them as a Lamb in a *large place.*" (Hos. iv. 16.) We may presume, therefore, that the country where they are settled is not only far to the west of Palestine, but is "a *large place*"—a very *extensive* country.—In this wide region, we may expect to find them roaming the solitary forests, and wandering about, in painful destitution of the word of God: For we are told, that "they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east," experiencing "a famine, not of bread, or of

water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." (Mic. vii. 14, and Amos viii. 11.)

In view of these hints, suggested by the ancient prophets, my readers will not be surprised when I express the opinion, that we are to look for the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel in the *wilds of America*, and indeed that they are no other than the *aborigines of this country*.—This is by no means a *novel* opinion. It has been entertained by numbers, in Europe, and in America, almost ever since this country was discovered. This, in a former age, was the opinion of President Willard, and Mr. Sewall, and Dr. Jonathan Edwards; and in later times, the same opinion has been received and advocated, by a Boudinot, a Jarvis, a Proudfit, a Smith, and many others.

If "the outcasts of Israel" are not to be found in America, *where*, suffer me to ask, *are they to be found?* Between two and three thousand years ago, they disappeared from the civilized world, and went *somewhere*—where we believe they now exist, a distinct people. Where then did they go? And where are they at present? They are not in Europe—they are not in Africa—and, so far as is known, they are not in Asia. The habitable earth has been to a very great extent explored, and unless we place them in the wilds of America, they are not to be found.

The natives of this continent, if we except the Esquimaux and Greenlanders, are manifestly *one* people. This is proved, from the similarity of their personal appearance, of their customs, of their religious worship and belief, and especially of their language. They are said, indeed to speak different tongues; but it is now agreed, by the best judges, that these are little more than different dialects of the same tongue. The natives of both the Americas, and of every part of the country, bear evident marks of a *common* origin, and of having descended from some common branch of the human family.—And not only are they of the same origin and race; they have preserved themselves in a great measure *distinct* from all other people. They are as distinct, at this day, almost, as the Jews are. In this view, they correspond exactly with what we might expect of the descendants of Israel.

That they *are* the descendants of Israel, is rendered probable by their *traditions*, respecting the coming and settlement of their forefathers in this country.—We have seen already, from the apocryphal history, that when the tribes of Israel left Media, they journeyed, in a northeasterly direction, "a year and a half." This might carry them to the northeast extremity of Asia, and very possibly over Bherring's straits, into the limits of America. In strict accordance with this account, the American natives have a tradition, that a long time ago their fathers came here from another country—that in their journey they passed over the great waters—and that they came to their present settlements from the northwest. The Mexicans not only had this tradition, but pretended that they could show the places where their fathers stopped, in their journey from the northwest coast. Here, then, on the one hand, we have an account of the tribes of Israel leaving Media, and travelling long enough in a northeasterly direction, to bring them very nearly,

if not quite, upon the northwest coast of America; and on the other, we have a current tradition of the Indians, that their fathers actually came from this coast, and beyond it, from another country.

Another argument, to show that the American Indians are the descendants of the Israelites, is derived from their *language*. Between the language of these Indians and the Hebrew, there is, to say the least, a strong affinity. This fact has been noticed by many writers, and by those too who were best able to form a judgment in the case. I could mention as many as thirty words, beside several phrases of some considerable length, which are almost precisely the same in Indian as in Hebrew. The Hebrew word, *Hallelujah*, so common in sacred music among ourselves, is still more common in the sacred songs of the Indians. The Hebrew word *Jehovah*, is in Indian *Yo-he-wah*. The Hebrew *Jah*, another name of the Deity, is in Indian *Yah*. And the Hebrew *Ale*, still another name for the Deity, is in Indian precisely the same. The construction of the Indian languages, by means of prefixes and suffixes, also gives it a striking resemblance to the Hebrew. How shall we account for the strong affinity between these languages, unless we suppose the American Indians to be in fact Israelites?

Some have thought that a similarity might be traced between the *features* of the American Indians, and those of the Jews. This was the opinion of the celebrated William Penn. In describing the natives, soon after his arrival among them, he says, "I found them with like countenances with the *Hebrew race*; and their children of so lively a resemblance to them, that a man would think himself in Duke's Place or Barry street, (the *Jew's corner*,) in London, when he sees them."

The American Indians have many traditions, corresponding with the *sacred history*, which can hardly be accounted for, unless on the supposition that their fathers were once acquainted with the inspired volume. They not only have traditions, like many of the heathen, of a general *deluge*, but retain some obscure ideas of numerous other facts, mentioned in the scriptures. They believe that the man was created from the earth, and that the woman was formed from a part of the man. They have a tradition of the *longevity* of the first inhabitants of the world, when men "lived till their feet were worn out with walking, and their throats with eating." They have a tradition of the *confusion of tongues*—that "a long time ago, the people went to build a high place; and that while they were building, they lost their language, and could not understand each other." They have a tradition that, a great while since, they had a common father, and that this father had twelve sons—in allusion, doubtless, to the twelve sons of Jacob. They tell us, "that their ancestors had once a sanctified rod, which *budded in a night's time*"—like the rod of Aaron. They believe that "the Great Spirit, in very ancient times, often held councils and smoked with their fathers, and gave them laws to be observed; but that in consequence of their disobedience, he withdrew from them, and abandoned them to the vexations of the bad spirit."—These traditionary accounts (to

which I have it in my power to add others) are very remarkable, and clearly indicate that the ancestors of the Indians must at some period have been acquainted with the sacred history of the Old Testament.

The religious *belief* of the American Indians differs materially from that of the other heathen nations, and agrees, in many points, with that of the ancient Israelites. They believe in the existence of *one God*, the great invisible Spirit, who created, and who constantly governs the world; and although all the tribes may not have kept themselves entirely free from idolatry; yet, in general, they agree, and have ever agreed, in directing their *worship* to God alone. They believe in a superintending *Providence*, and manifest often a degree of gratitude on the reception of favors, and of submission in adversity, which would not discredit professing Christians. Their sense of dependence on the Great Spirit, leads them very frequently to *pray* to him. "Every morning," say our Missionaries among the Osages, "we hear them, on all sides around us, to a great distance from their camp, engaged in very earnest prayer to God their Creator. This they do likewise on all extraordinary occasions, as when they receive any distinguishing favor." Such was their practice when the Missionaries found them, and before they had received any religious instruction. The Indians believe in the existence of *angels* and *demons*, and that the demons have a chief over them, who is more wicked than the rest. They believe that they are themselves "*the beloved people*" of the Great Spirit, as the ancient Israelites did; that they were the peculiar, chosen people of God. The Indians also believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, to be distributed according to the characters which are sustained here. If now we compare these religious views and traits with those of the debased and idolatrous heathen, in Asia, and in other parts of the world; we shall discover a *difference* for which it will not be easy to account, but by supposing the remote ancestors of the American Indians to have been acquainted with Divine revelation.

[To be continued.]

For the Christian Magazine.

A REPLY TO N. ON CHRISTIANS' PRAYING FOR PERFECTION.

Messrs. Editors,—In your number for June, I find an article on the question, "*Is it the duty of saints to pray for perfection in holiness in this life?*"

I entered upon the reading of that communication with interest; and with no other expectation, than that it would answer the question affirmatively;—that the burden of it would be to urge christians to renewed diligence—to labor, and most earnestly to *pray* for perfection in holiness;—in a word, that it would allow them to aim at nothing but perfection. I felt that this was what I needed, and therefore, as I said, I gave my attention to the article with interest. But what were my feelings, when I came upon the second paragraph, and found the question uncerimoniously decided in the negative? I was roused like one coming out of a waking dream. I began to look about myself, to see where I was, with whom I was associated, and what was coming to be the fash-

ion of the times. I hardly knew whether to suppose I was among Hopkinsians, Triangulars, or Free-thinkers.

Now I am not going to write a sermon, dissertation, or essay; but simply say, that my apprehensions on this subject were directly contrary to the writer's, and are so still. And that for two reasons: first, the *tenour of scripture*, and secondly, the *dictates of piety*. Every unprejudiced mind, glancing through the Bible, and catching its spirit on this subject, will feel urged most powerfully to "go on unto perfection,"—to labour, and to pray most fervently, for the attainment of perfect holiness. Every emotion of piety, too, prompts thus to pray; and every christian, if he does not studiously avoid it, will thus pray, I had almost said unconsciously, merely from the impulse of his pious feelings.

If we are not to aim at *perfect* holiness, both in effort and in prayer, I beg you will tell me, at *how much* we must aim? What is the maximum of attainment, beyond which we must make no advance, nor even pray for any? At what point, in the progress of sanctification, must we stop, and no longer pray for improvement? For ought that I know, I have already reached that point—have come to the bounds God has set, so that I ought no longer to pray for *actual progress*, however much I may desire it *in itself*. This may be the case, too, with others; and how, I ask, are we to know? Is not here a grand defect in our Bible? It never occurred to me before as such, but I strongly believe the Bible no where fixes this boundary. I strongly believe, that not one of its effaceless lines points to any stopping place, or limits any petition, short of "be ye holy for I am holy,"—"be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

One of three things must be true;—either perfection is the point to be aimed at,—or the Bible does not fix this point, and is therefore defective,—or, in the original plan of giving a revelation, this writer was foreseen, and it was left for him to finish out what otherwise would have been defective.

But perhaps I ought to refer more particularly to the article in question. The writer says, "we must answer the question in the negative, for this plain reason,—that God has determined not to make saints perfectly holy in this life." Starting with this position, he proceeds with his reasoning thus:—'1. We may not pray for any thing contrary to the divine determination:'—'2. We cannot exercise faith in thus praying:'—'3. God forbids our praying for what he will not grant:'—'4. To do it, is as improper as to pray for the conversion of the spirits in prison.' No doubt. All this reasoning is as impregnable as the battlements of Gibraltar. If the writer speaks, as he is understood, of the divine determination so far as it is made known as a rule of duty, not a dog will move his tongue against his inferences. His refutation of objections, too, is equally beyond annoyance from any of the machinery of logic. But, finding that all his reasonings, and answers to objections, fall directly back upon "this plain reason," I turned with not a little interest to examine that, and the evidence in support of it; supposing of course this *corner stone* would not be left on sand. And what did I find? Why, this remarkable dec-

laration; "that this is the divine determination, I shall not stand to prove, since it is readily conceded by all;" "but only deduce from it the consequence that it cannot be the duty of christians to pray for what they know God will not grant." This very position, then, on which, confessedly, all rests, is taken for granted. But is it one of those self-evident truths which the writer is at liberty to assume? Is it what, in the exact sciences, would be called a *postulate?* If so, he has an undoubted right to it, and to all his deductions from it; but if it is not, he cannot call me unreasonable if I say, that to the "all," who readily concede the point, there is one exception; and if I ask, too, that he will develope fully the evidence on which his position rests.

Here I might stop; but I said I have two reasons for a sentiment contrary to that of the writer:—the promptings of piety, and the general tenour of scripture. Every emotion of piety in the heart, prompts us to pray for perfect holiness. And when I say this is a reason why we should thus pray, I am not to be charged with setting these feelings against the Bible, as a rule of duty. They accord with it; and when it is shown that they do not, then will be time enough for me to say they are not the offspring of that Spirit which gave us the scriptures. They are the impress of that Bible on the heart; and the more we catch its spirit, the more perfect this impress will become; as the picture becomes more perfect, under the repeated touches of the painter. What says the Bible on this subject? "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." See, too, Eph. iv. 7—13, where gifts and graces are bestowed; also, "prophets, apostles, evangelists, pastors and teachers, given, for the perfection of the saints," &c. "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written, be ye holy, for I am holy." But why do I quote particular texts? The spirit of the Bible bears us high as heaven above the sentiment I am opposing. Where does the Bible point to any thing short of perfect obedience—perfect holiness, as the only attainment, to be aimed at by unceasing effort and prayer? And when are we to render this obedience—to possess this holiness? In the grave, or after death? *Now*, to-day, this moment. The obligation to become so *in fact*, and not merely in the *nature of the case*, is complete upon us. And no change in the divine determination; no event in time, or in eternity, will render it more so.

And now are we to be told, that 'this view of the scriptures must be explained away;' and are we to believe it, simply on the *supposition* that the *assumption*, with which the writer started, is *true?* I think, after a little reflection, he will not ask it. Surely the consideration that "the sentiment advocated must be given up," unless "the texts referred to be explained in some other sense," is a poor reason why they should be. When I

look at "N.'s" last paragraph, I feel prompted to say, that a criticism involving a question so important, and touching so deeply the spirit of the Bible, ought to bear stronger marks of having been written by the lamp.

Respectfully yours, J. ANONA.

For the Christian Magazine.

MINISTERS' PRONOUNCING THE BENEDICTION.

Messrs. Editors,—When I have heard the Preachers of the Gospel conclude their public services, by pronouncing a blessing upon the whole congregation, I have often been ready to doubt whether they or the people understood the precise meaning of their benediction. I know the Jewish priests were expressly required, in the sixth chapter of Numbers, to bless the people in the name of the Lord. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; The Lord lift his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them." Here the first question that occurs is, *When* should the Priests pronounce this blessing upon the people, whether at the close of religious worship on the Sabbath, or on some other solemn occasions. Neither the time, nor occasion is specified. Bishop Pierson, however, supposes, that the Priests blessed the people only at the close of the morning sacrifice, and not of the evening sacrifice. What ground he had for his opinion, I do not know. The next question is, Who blessed the people, whether God, or the Priests? Certainly not the Priests. They could only pray, that God would bless them; and the form they were to use, plainly implies this: "The *Lord* bless thee, The *Lord* make his face shine upon thee," &c. Another question is, Whether this command is binding upon the Ministers of the Gospel at the present day? They are not Priests in the same sense that Aaron and his sons were; and we have no reason to suppose, that a command given to Priests under the *Law*, is applicable to Ministers under the *Gospel*. There is no evidence in the New Testament, that either Christ, or the Apostles, ever dismissed a religious assembly, by pronouncing a blessing upon them. Hence it is very natural to conclude, that the present practice of the Preachers of the Gospel in pronouncing a benediction at the close of public worship, is derived, not from any scriptural authority, but from a long, immemorial, pious example of their predecessors in the ministry. Such an example we deem abundantly sufficient to justify their practice. But both Ministers and people may differ in opinion upon this subject. I am apt to think, that most of the Episcopal clergy, and many of the Presbyterian and Congregational clergy, mean to follow the Jewish Priests, and pronounce the benediction upon the whole congregation *authoritatively*, which in their view, and in the view of the people, gives it a peculiar significancy, solemnity, and importance. Understood, *in this sense*, and pronounced, *in this manner*, the benediction amounts to an absolute *promise* of God, that he will certainly *bless* all

those upon whom it is pronounced. But I would fain believe and hope, that the Presbyterian and Congregational clergy in general, and their people, consider the usual benediction at the close of divine worship, as a short, solemn petition, or prayer, that God would be pleased to *bless* the whole congregation. Such a direct and devout address to the throne of divine grace is agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel, and is the only proper mode of closing the religious services of the sanctuary.

A CONGREGATIONALIST.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAP. X.

Thoughtful. The times are much changed since the pilgrim *Christian* passed this way.

Prudence. They are, indeed, changed in many respects. Very few could go on pilgrimage then, without exposing themselves to the loss of their goods, and many suffered bonds and imprisonments, and some even death itself.

Ardent. All such dangers are past, I trust, forever.

Pr. Perhaps not forever. It is as true now, as then, that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." It is not persecution, indeed, in the same form now. Most civil governments now find it for their interest to protect the life, liberty and property of their subjects, let their religious opinions and practices be what they may. But the same spirit of opposition to all true pilgrims, still exists, and is manifested in a great variety of ways.

Ard. But I suppose that the influence of true religion is now so extensively felt, and so rapidly increasing, that it would be impossible to bring any civil government to authorise a persecution for conscience' sake.

Pr. Perhaps it may be ascribed to this, in part. I think it is also to be ascribed, in part, to the change which has taken place in the views of civilized nations, in regard to the political rights of men. This change of views in regard to the political rights of men, may have been a consequence of the influence of real religion in former generations; and the effect may have remained where the cause has ceased. The advocates of licentiousness also, who have been so numerous within the last century, have found it for their interest to favor the cause of civil and religious liberty, at least, in profession, in order the better to forward their own designs. These things may account for there being now no persecutions unto death for conscience' sake, without supposing there is any less enmity of heart against true religion now, than there was in the days of the pilgrim Christian.

Ard. Do you think, then, that there is not now much more true religion in the world than there was then?

Pr. Perhaps there is. But, as religion of some kind is quite fashionable now, there may not be so much in reality as there is in appearance. Great numbers do indeed assume the pilgrim's dress and name, but many, by their walk, give reason to fear that they are not true pilgrims. Our neighbors, who have set up the new house, and call themselves by our names, entertain many more than we do. If true religion has had some increase,

as we hope it has, of late years, it is evident that false religion has had a great increase also. Several new denominations of errorists have sprung up, since Christian's time, which now number their thousands, and some their hundreds of thousands. And many of the children of those who were renowned pilgrims in those days, have been carried away with prevailing errors, and never call at our house. And some, who we hope are real pilgrims at heart, stay with us but a short time, and seem to be afraid to lay open their hearts to us.

Ard. I had supposed that true religion was greatly on the increase, and that no period had been so distinguished as the present for revivals of religion.

Pr. Revivals of religion are probably more frequent at the present day, than they have been for many years before. And every genuine revival is an increase of true religion. But, as every single christian grace has its counterfeit, so doubtless that collection of graces, which constitutes a revival of religion, may have its counterfeit also. And the more revivals of religion prevail, and the higher the esteem which is felt for them, the more it is to be apprehended that the great deceiver will employ his art in endeavouring to imitate them. It would not be safe therefore, to conclude that every religious excitement is a genuine revival, any more than that all the money in circulation is genuine coin. But as counterfeits are never attempted where there is nothing genuine to be counterfeited, the frequent recurrence of what are called revivals, (though many of them should prove revivals of false religion,) affords reason to conclude there is an increase of true religion, as well as of false. And when we come to compare the fruits they produce, this conclusion receives additional confirmation; for the fruit of some of them is undeniably good.

Thoughtful. I perceive that it is necessary to distinguish the chaff from the wheat. But many complain of those who attempt to do so, as if they wished to destroy the wheat as well as the chaff.

Pr. Such complaints are highly unreasonable; and no prudent man would be deterred by them from carefully separating his wheat from the chaff before he lays it up in his granary for use. Those who wish to vend their chaff under the name of wheat, may indeed, complain of such as attempt to distinguish them; but those who really value the wheat for its excellent quality, will wish to have it separated from every worthless material, with which it may be mixed.—Or, to use the other figure, none but those who have an interest in the circulation of counterfeit money will be likely to complain of those who try to assist the public in distinguishing the counterfeit from the true.

Ard. I have not only supposed that true religion is greatly on the increase, but that it would continue to increase and prevail, till the whole world shall become true pilgrims, and that that happy day cannot be far distant.

Pr. The time is no doubt approaching, perhaps it is near at hand, when the knowledge of the Lord shall fill the earth, as the waters cover the seas.—But there may be a dark and trying day for true pilgrims before the time arrives.

Ard. You surprise me. I thought the church had seen her darkest days, long since; and

that there now remained but little for her to do, but to take possession of the whole earth as her own.

Pr. If you will look into the predictions contained in the King's book, of the introduction of those happy days, you will find that they are almost uniformly connected with terrible and wasting judgments upon the enemies of the King. If all are about to become his friends, where will be the enemies that are to be destroyed from off the earth?

Ard. I had not attended to that fact. I recollect, indeed, that the Prince Immanuel says, in one place, "the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." But is it not promised to the Prince Immanuel, in the second Psalm, that he shall have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession?

Pr. Yes, they are to be delivered into his hands to be disposed of at his pleasure. But what has he to do with them? It is said in the next verse, "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." And the 19th chapter of Revelation contains a description of a most terrible destruction of the enemies of Immanuel, in which so many are to perish, that all the fowls of heaven are to be filled with their flesh; which is immediately followed by the binding of Satan, for a thousand years. In this description, it is said of the Prince Immanuel, "and out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." This passage seems to refer to the aforementioned Psalm, and also to a passage in the 63d chapter of the prophet Isaiah, which chapter contains the verse you mentioned.—In that chapter the church asks, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?" And Immanuel answers, "I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." Again the church asks, "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?" And he answers, "I have trodden the wine press alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled on my garmens, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." The chapters connected with this contain promises of the happy days of the church, which are to be introduced by this terrible destruction of her enemies. The enemies of the church, then, and of the great Head of the church, are to be very numerous in the time immediately preceding the day of millenial glory: and are not to be converted, but destroyed in a most terrible manner.

Thought. Is there reason to expect a further increase of error and false religion, in order to prepare the way for that appearance of the prince Immanuel, so glorious in the eyes of his friends, so terrible to his enemies?

Pr. I think there is. Connected with the drying up of the river Euphrates, in order to prepare the way of the kings of the

East, the beloved disciple says; "And I saw three unclean spirits, like frogs, come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." I take this to mean, that error, and delusion, and false religion are to prevail, in order to gather men to the battle of the great day.

Thought. Are there any prophecies which speak expressly of the prevalence of error in the last times?

Pr. Yes; there are many. The following are some of them. *"This know also, in the last days, perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts: ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron." "Knowing this first that there shall come in the last days, scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you, there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungoldly lusts. These be they which separate themselves, sensual, having not the spirit."

Thought. Is it not reasonable to expect, that if error thus prevails, it will be accompanied with a more violent opposition to the truth, than now appears, and even a persecution of its friends, to banishment and death?

Pr. I think it is not unreasonable to expect such a consequence. Whenever civil governments have persecuted, it has been under the pretence that those they so treated, were enemies to the state. When the number of the friends of truth shall have become small, and error greatly prevails, it will not be strange if laws should be enacted which true christians cannot conscientiously obey; and must therefore submit to their penalties, or flee for their lives.

Thought. I remember that the mistresses of the new house,

*2 Tim. iii. 1—8, and iv. 3, 4. 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2. 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4. Jude, 17—19.

where we staid last night, boasted that many of the King's ambassadors were acting under their influence, and propagating their maxims. If this is true, it doubtless contributes very much to accelerate the progress of error.

Pr. It is to be feared that some, whom the King has sent forth, have been imposed upon by them, and fallen too much under their influence.—And there is no doubt that very many who call themselves the King's ambassadors, are heartily engaged in the same cause with themselves.

Ard. It is greatly to be lamented that any who maintain the character of the true ambassadors of the King should lend their influence, in any way, to the propagation of error. I trust they cannot do it to any great extent, or they would themselves discover their fault, and reform.

Pr. Perhaps they do it more extensively than they themselves are aware of. By complying with the maxims of Carnal-Policy, under the name of Prudence, they exert a powerful influence against the cause of truth, in many ways. And if they at the same time support the character of great and good men, it greatly increases that influence. One individual of this description, who does so, is likely to use his influence with his brethren to persuade them to do likewise. The native temper of the human heart is on the side of error, and against the truth. If the truth is kept out of sight for fear of giving offence, the contrary error will be embraced, and spread among the people. If one such man keeps back some of the most offensive truths which others preach, his example will be pleaded as a proof that the others do wrong. And if he is inquired of, on the subject, he will scarcely fail of saying something in his own justification, which will go to condemn his more faithful brethren. He will then render himself popular with those who hate the truth; and being esteemed a great and good man, he will have influence with many who love the truth, to make them think it imprudent to press it upon the consciences of those who dislike it. And thus he will be destroying the influence of his more faithful brethren, and setting even the friends of truth themselves against the faithful declaration of it. And when the influence of his more faithful brethren is, by this means, destroyed, it is said at once that they lost it by their own imprudent conduct; and the loss of it is pleaded as a proof that their conduct was wrong. And thus, the evil accumulates, and extends itself far and wide; and the consequences go down to succeeding ages, and are never fully known till the day of judgment discloses them, and the eternal pit re-echoes with the groans of those who have been destroyed for ever by this means.

Thought. What did the great apostle of the Gentiles mean, when he said, he 'became all things to all men, that he might by all means save some?'

Pr. It is evident that he did not mean a compliance with any thing unlawful. And from what he elsewhere says, it is plain that he considered it unlawful to disguise or keep back the great truths of the Gospel. From the connexion in which he says it, it appears, that a compliance with the ceremonies of the law of Moses, when among the Jews, and an omission of them when among the Gentiles, were the

things chiefly spoken of. A compliance with the *innocent* customs of those among whom we are, in order to gain their attention to the truth, would be in accordance with his declaration and example. "To the weak, he says, became I as weak, that I might gain the weak." That is, he adapted his instructions to the capacity of his hearers, and took pains to teach them in such a manner as to be understood; not making a vain ostentation of his learning or talents, to excite the admiration of his hearers, but giving his instructions in a plain and familiar manner.

Thought. What did he mean by saying to the Corinthians, "I have fed you with *milk*, and not with *meat;* for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able?"

Pr. By *milk*, he doubtless meant the first principles of the gospel, those plain, fundamental truths, the belief and love of which are so necessary to the growth and comfort of the children of God; and by *meat*, such truths as are less necessary to be known, and more difficult to be understood. What those truths are which he calls *milk*, may be learned from what he proceeded to teach to the Corinthians, after making this declaration. They are the same truths he taught in all his epistles, and in all his preaching; and what he calls *meat*, we may gather from such truths as he taught to others, but not to the Corinthians. Perhaps the connexion of the ceremonial law with the christian dispensation, and the things signified by its various types and shadows, and the prophecies respecting the millennium, are of this description. He taught these things to others, but not to the Corinthians. Many in these days of abounding error and iniquity, wrest these declarations of the apostle, to justify themselves in practices which the same apostle most pointedly condemns, and which his whole practice contradicts.

After this conversation, the pilgrims were taken to see the rarities of the house, which had been shown to *Christian* and other pilgrims before; after which they returned to dinner, which was a meal of the same description as their former one; and after they had dined, they sung the following hymn:

"In thine own ways, O God of love,
We wait the visits of thy grace;
Our souls' desire is to thy name,
And the remembrance of thy face.

Look how rebellious men deride
The tender patience of our God;
But they shall feel thy lifted hand,
And feel the scourges of thy rod.

Hark! the eternal rends the sky,
A mighty voice before him goes;
A voice of music to his friends,
But threat'ning thunder to his foes.

Come, children, to your Father's arms,
Hide in the chambers of my grace,
Till the fierce storms be over-blown,
And my revenging fury cease.

My sword shall boast its thousands slain,
And drink the blood of haughty kings;
While heavenly peace around my flock
Stretches its soft and shady wings."

BUNYANUS.

THE PIOUS FAMILY, AND THE CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS.

Soon after the surrender of Copenhagen to the English, in the year 1807, detachments of soldiers were for a time stationed in the surrounding villages. It happened one day, that three soldiers belonging to a highland regiment, were sent to forage among the neighboring farm-houses.—They went to several, but found them stript and deserted. At length they came to a large garden, or orchard, full of ap-

ple trees, bending under the weight of fruit. They entered by a gate, and followed a path which brought them to a neat farm-house. Every thing without bespoke quietness and security; but as they entered by the front door, the mistress of the house and her children ran screaming out at the back. The interior of the house presented an appearance of order and comfort superior to what might be expected from people in that station, and from the habits of the country. A watch hung by the side of the fire place, and a neat book-case, well filled, attracted the attention of the elder soldier. He took down a book; it was written in a language unknown to him, but the name of Jesus Christ was legible on every page. At this moment the master of the house entered through the door through which his wife and children had just fled. One of the soldiers by threatening signs, demanded provisions; the man stood firm and undaunted, but shook his head. The soldier who held the book, approaching him, and pointing to the name of Jesus Christ, laid his hand on his heart and looked up to heaven. Instantly the farmer grasped his hand, shook it vehemently, and then ran out of the room. He soon returned with his wife and children, laden with milk, eggs, bacon, &c. which were freely tendered; and when money was offered in return, it was refused. But as two of the soldiers were pious men, they, much to the chagrin of their companion, (who swore grievously he would never forage with them again,) insisted upon paying for all they took. When taking leave, the pious soldiers intimated to the farmer, that it would be well for him to secrete his watch; by the most significant signs, he gave them to understand, that he feared no evil, for his trust was in God; and that though his neighbors, on the right hand and on the left, had fled from their habitations, and by foraging parties had lost what they could not remove, not a hair of his head had been injured, nor had he ever lost an apple from his trees. "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them."—*Wes. Meth. Mag.*

Ordinations and Installations.

At Brampton, England, as Missionaries to the heathen, Rev. James Tomlin, and Rev. John Smith. The first Prayer was made by Rev. Dr. Philip, who had just arrived from the Cape of Good Hope, where he officiates as superintendent of missions in the interior. The Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Morrison, missionary to China, who was about to return to the scene of his labors, after a visit to England. The assembly was addressed by Rev. Henry Townley, formerly a missionary in India.

Ordained, at Rahway, N. J. Rev. Alfred Chester, as Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in that place. Sermon by Rev. John G. Bergen, of Bottle Hill.

Aug. 16,—Rev. James P. Richardson was ordained Pastor over the first Congregational Church in Poland, Me. Sermon by Rev. Josiah G. Merrill, of Otisfield.

THE

HRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

L. III. OCTOBER, 1826. No. 10.

For the Christian Magazine.

UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD.

God is unchangeable, may, a high degree of probability, fered from the uniformity s operations in the natural l. Almost six thousand years elapsed since the world was ed. During all this period, nd night, summer and win- eed-time and harvest, have mly appeared according to respective order of succes- By means of the attraction avitation, the sun has re- d stationary in the centre system, while all the plan- ave been constantly and uni- y revolving around him, in a certain, definite period ie. By the operation of the principle, the earth has revolved around its own —the moon, in a given peri- is revolved around the earth, vith the earth, has perform- annual circuit around the The vegetable kingdom has ally revived, come to matu- and decayed. One genera- of men after another has ap- ed on the stage of earthly ence, continued here, a cer- period, and then gone down ie grave. The more crit- the works of nature have been examined, the more regular and uniform have they been found to be in their operations. So great is this regularity, that Eclipses may be infallibly calculated, hundreds of years before the time of their actual occurrence. Those laws, according to which this regularity and uniformity of operation in the natural world take place, are commonly denominated *the laws of nature*:—though with more propriety, in the language of scripture, "*the ordinances of heaven.*" For, the laws of nature, so far from operating independently of God, are simply those rules or methods, according to which he acts, in governing the world. Accordingly, the Psalmist says;—"*He appointeth the moon for seasons*,—the sun knoweth his going down. When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, *the moon and stars, which thou hast ordained.*"

From that unifermity in the operation of the laws of nature, or, the ordinances of heaven, which has been briefly described, it may, with a high degree of probability, be infered, that God is unchangeable. On the supposition, that he is a changeable being, it must be extremely diffi-

cult, if not impossible, to account for that regularity and uniformity, with which he has, for almost six thousand years, been governing the works of nature. It is natural to conclude, that, during this period, he would have frequently changed his mind, and have subjected the system of things to many and great alterations. It is not to be supposed, that he would, for so long a period, have continued of one and the same mind. What alterations in the natural world he would have made, it is, indeed, impossible for us to divine. For ought we know to the contrary, he would have blotted out the sun, the moon, and the stars, and thus have involved this lower world in perpetual darkness. Instead of that agreeable and useful variety in the seasons, with which the earth has actually been visited, he would, perhaps, for a long period, have subjected it to one uninterrupted season of winter. Or, he would, for an equally long period, have subjected its inhabitants to the unremitting heat of a summer's sun. Far otherwise, however, has God proceeded in the government of the natural world. Let it be carefully considered with what regularity and uniformity he *has* proceeded in governing it, and we shall hardly fail to conclude, that unchangeableness is, indeed, an attribute of his being.

This may be conclusively infered from the fact, that unchangeableness is essential to the infinite perfection of his character. A changeable being is, necessarily, an imperfect being. An imperfect being may so change, as to become either more or less imperfect, than he is at any given time. But not so is it with an infinitely perfect being. Such a being cannot, of course, so change, as to become possessed of more than infinite perfection. Hence, any change in him would necessarily be from perfection to imperfection. It is not possible for God to become possessed of more knowledge, more wisdom, more goodness, or more power, than he is possessed of, at the present time. For, even now, knowledge, wisdom, goodness, and power do appertain to him, each, in an infinite degree. If, therefore, it were possible for him to undergo any change at all, it would necessarily consist in a diminution of one or more of these attributes. He would become less knowing, less wise, less good, or less powerful, than he now is;—and, of course, would change from infinite perfection to imperfection. It is, therefore, plain, that unchangeableness is absolutely necessary to his infinite perfection;—and, consequently, is an attribute of his nature.

This is, moreover, positively asserted in the inspired volume. By his prophet Malachi, God says; "I am the Lord;—*I change not.*" St. James affirms, that with "the Father of lights *is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.*" And St. Paul, speaking of our Saviour with respect to his Divine nature, denominates him—"*Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.*"

But, if God is absolutely unchangeable, it may be asked, what is to be understood by those passages of his word, in which he is said to have repented, that he had done, or had threatened to do, particularly specified things. He is said, for example, to have repented, that he had made man upon the earth, and, on this account, to have been grieved at his heart. He is, also, said to have repented,

that he had made Saul king over his ancient people. With respect to all such passages of his word, it may be remarked, that they are used in gracious accommodation to the mind and manner of men;—just as we often address little children in their own language, and according to their own manner of speaking, that we may the more clearly convey our ideas to their comparatively feeble minds. A man, who has been grossly wronged and abused by those, to whom he has been very kind, often repents of his kindness to them, and grieves, that he has conferred so many ill-requited favors upon them. In such a case, there is a *real* change of mind in him. It is, however, impossible, that God should really repent, or be grieved, on account of any thing he has said or done; —or should *really* wish, he had never said or done it. At the same time, he is, with much beauty and propriety, said, in accommodation to the language and manner of men, to repent, and to wish, that he had not done or said certain things, when, in consequence of a change of character in his intelligent creatures, he changes his conduct toward them, and does not treat them, as he formerly treated them, or threatened or promised to treat them. Passages like those, that are now the subject of remark, convey the truth to our minds in a familiar, perspicuous manner; and, at the same time, are guarded against misapprehension by other passages of the inspired word, and by the known, essential attributes of the divine being.

It may be further inquired, how the unchangeableness of God is consistent with encouragement to prayer. In order to show the consistency between them, let it, in the first place, be remarked, that it is not the design of true and acceptable prayer to induce God to change his mind, or alter his will. "Prayer is an offering up of our desires to God *for things agreeable to his will.*" When our Saviour earnestly prayed, that the cup might pass from him, he concluded by desiring, that, not his own will, but the will of his Father in heaven might be done. Hence, he prayed in entire submission to the divine will. In this respect he is imitated by all the friends of God. It is not their desire, nor expectation, when they address him in prayer, to effect any alteration in him, either by giving him information of what he does not already know, or by exciting affections in him, which he does not already possess, or by inducing him to change measures, which he has already formed. They do not desire him to confer on themselves or others the particular things, for which they pray, unless he can do this in entire consistency with his wise, good, and adorable will. The submissive language of their hearts is; —"Father, not our will, but thine be done." Prayer, offered with an opposite disposition of the heart, so far from being acceptable to God, is even an act of impiety in his sight.

That the consistency between the unchangeableness of God and encouragement to prayer, may the more clearly be perceived, it may be further remarked, that God is unchangeably disposed and determined to hear and answer prayer. That he has determined to bestow innumerable blessings on his creatures, will not be questioned. Nor can it be questioned by any, who admit the truth of his word, that one medium, thro'

which he has determined to bestow blessings upon them, is prayer. Almost one entire chapter of the prophecy of Ezekiel, is composed of divine promises of temporal and spiritual good to the house of Israel. God concluded these promises by saying; "I the Lord have spoken it, and I will do it." He, nevertheless, added;—"*I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them.*" Here we see, that he had not merely determined to bestow the particularly specified blessings upon the house of Israel, but had also determined to bestow them in answer to prayer. Between his determination, in this case, to bestow particular blessings on his people, and their praying to him for them, there was, therefore, an indissoluble connexion. And it is so in other cases. He has unchangeably determined, that they, who receive, shall ask,—that they, who find, shall seek,—and that they, to whom he opens, shall knock for admittance. He has instituted an indissoluble connexion between prayer and the reception of blessings from him; or, in other words, he is unchangeably disposed and determined to hear and answer prayer. How, then, can his unchangeableness operate as a discouragement to prayer? If he were unchangeably determined not to hear and answer prayer, there would, indeed, be no encouragement to pray unto him. But since it is in entire accordance with the very nature of his unchangeableness, to bestow blessings in answer to prayer, we have the highest possible encouragement to look to him for them by prayer and supplication. His unchangeableness does, indeed, lie at the foundation of all encouragement to prayer. Were he a changeable being, it would be altogether uncertain, whether he would answer prayer, notwithstanding he has promised to hear and answer it. In that case, we could not possibly know, that what he requires to-day, he would require to-morrow,—that what he is willing to do for us now, he would be willing to do for us at any future time. Prayers, which are now acceptable to him, might, at any future time, be unacceptable to him, and even odious in his sight. The things, that are the most proper to be asked in prayer to-day, might be the least proper to be prayed for to-morrow. By the very fact of his changeableness, therefore, all motives and encouragements to prayer would be precluded. God is, however, without variableness or the shadow of turning. And with what confidence are his true friends inspired, by this consideration, to draw near unto him, as to a father, and to offer holy desires to him, for things agreeable to his will. They feel assured, that what he now requires, he will require forever,—that prayers, which are acceptable to him to-day, will be acceptable to him at all future times,—and that he will confer on them the particular things, for which they pray, whenever he can do this consistently with a regard to his own glory, and their own best good.

If God is unchangeable, then he is eternal. As he is self-existent, and as no change has ever yet taken place in him, he has of course existed from eternity just as he now is. And since he could not cease to exist, without undergoing an infinite change, he will of course exist forever. Hence, eternal existence is an attribute of his nature. Accor-

dingly, we find this attribute ascribed to him in his word. "I lift my hand to heaven, and say, *I live forever.* Thy years are throughout all generations. Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end. Even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God."

If God is unchangeable, then he has never had, nor will ever have, any new thoughts or purposes. If, at any given period during past eternity, new thoughts entered his mind, a change in his mind was, at that period, necessarily produced. And, for the same reason, a change in his mind would necessarily be produced by the entrance of new thoughts into it, at any period of eternity to come. By the fact of his unchangeableness, therefore, all possibility for him ever to have any new thoughts, is precluded. What, indeed, is there in existence, from which he can receive a new thought? That he is perfectly acquainted with himself, cannot be questioned. Hence, he cannot derive a single new thought from the contemplation of his own existence and perfections. Nor can he receive new thoughts from the contemplation of his own works. For, these, with all their qualities, all their operations, and all their results, have necessarily been intuitively present to his infinite mind, during all past eternity. Accordingly, his understanding is declared to be infinite;—and it is said, that "known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world. Neither is there any creature, that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him, with whom we have to do." But, for the same reason, that God has never had, nor will ever have, any new thoughts, he has never had, nor will ever have, any new purposes. New purposes or determinations, if formed by him at all, must be formed in consequence of some new thoughts or views of his mind. Hence, since the thoughts or views of his mind are unchangeably the same, his purposes or determinations must also be unchangeable. All his purposes, like himself, are immutable and eternal. The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, —the thoughts of his heart to all generations."

If God is unchangeable, then he will fulfil his promises and execute his threatnings. Were he a changeable being, there would not be the least degree of certainty, that any of his great and precious promises would ever be fulfilled, or any of his threatnings would ever be executed. But that he assuredly will fulfil the former, and execute the latter, may be conclusively infered from the fact of his immutability. In every case, in which the condition of any particular promise is performed, or the moral character, against which any particular threatening is directed, is continued to be sustained, he must fulfil that promise, and execute that threatening, or falsify his word, and thus change from infinite perfection to sinful imperfection. Accordingly, he himself says, that he will not suffer his faithfulness to fail. And it is said concerning him, that he abideth faithful,—that his faithfulness reacheth to the clouds,—that he is the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations. Particular instances, in which he fulfilled his promises and executed his threatenings,

are specified. It is said, that there failed not aught of any good thing, which he spake to the house of Israel, but all came to pass; and that those things, which God showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he fulfilled. And with respect to his threatenings it is said; —"The Lord hath fulfilled his word, that he commanded in the days of old; he hath thrown down, and hath not pitied; he hath caused thine enemy to rejoice over thee."

If God is unchangeable, therefore it is, that we are continued in existence. "I am the Lord,—I change not;—*therefore, ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.*" Such was the wickedness,—the heaven-daring provocations of those, to whom God addressed these words, that nothing, but his immutable bevevolence and unchangeable mercy, prevented him from immediately sinking them into their primitive state of non-existence. For the same reason it is, that *we* are not consumed. We could not, with impunity, treat a fellow-creature, for a single week, as we have been treating our Maker during all the past periods of our lives. His resentment would be enkindled against us, and he would take measures to have merited punishment inflicted upon us. Such are the coldness, the indifference, and the unfaithfulness of even the best friends of God upon earth, that were he a changeable being, he would cut them down as an incumbrance of the ground. He bears with their multiplied provocations, only because great is his faithfulness, and his compassions toward them fail not. And as to his enemies,—those who hate him without a cause,—live in constant violation of his commands,—and refuse to repent and turn unto him;—were he, like themselves, subject to change, the fire of his wrath would immediately burn so dreadfully against them, that it would leave them neither root nor branch, but would utterly consume them from the earth. That they were not long ago thus consumed, is, because he is the Lord, and changes not;—because he is long-suffering toward them, not willing, that they should perish, but should come to repentance and be saved.

If God is unchangeable, then his friends may place supreme and unwavering confidence in him. When they consider, that he is not only infinitely wise, and good, and powerful, but *unchangeably so*, they cannot but perceive, that they may place supreme and unwavering confidence in him without the least danger of disappointment. Were he subject to change, they could not, without liability to disappointment, place such confidence in him, for a single moment. But, on the immutability of his character they may place a hope, that can never make them ashamed. They may feel an unwavering confidence, that all his promises to his saints, however great and precious in themselves, —being the promises of one who changes not, nor can deceive,—will infallibly be fulfilled. Thus, his immutable name is a strong tower, into which they may run, and be safe in the hour of death, —on the day of judgment,—and in eternity.

If God is unchangeable,—then let the wicked be alarmed. Were he a changeable being, you would have reason, O wicked man, to hope, that, sooner or later, he would take part with you, and fail to put his threatnings against you into execution. As it is,

however, all room for such a hope is precluded. He has said, that he supremely hates sin. He has threatened to punish the finally impenitent with everlasting destruction from his blissful presence and from the glory of his power. He is the Lord, and changeth not. You may, therefore, assuredly know, that his opposition to sin and sinners will never terminate,—that all his threatenings against them will be fully executed;—and, hence, that, if you live and die impenitent, you will certainly be sentenced to depart accursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Do not indulge the hope, that, living and dying without reconciliation to God, you shall, notwithstanding, in some way, escape the wrath to come. "Except you repent, you must perish. He that believeth not on the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." F.

For the Christian Magazine.

ON PRAYER.

If sinners ought, as well as all other men, to pray, notwithstanding they are totally depraved; then they have no right to plead in excuse for neglecting prayer, that they are taught the doctrine of total depravity, or any other gospel doctrine. If the true doctrine of total depravity, or any other true doctrine of the gospel, laid them under a *natural inability* to offer up proper desires to God for things agreeable to his will, then they might justly plead in excuse for neglecting prayer, that they were taught to neglect it, by those who preach the doctrine of decrees, the doctrine of total depravity, and the efficacious grace of God in regeneration. But if this excuse were true, it would not prove that ministers preach wrong, but only that the true doctrines of the gospel are inconsistent with each other. This, it is apprehended, many think is really the case. But if the Bible be true, all its doctrines are harmonious and perfectly consistent. Those, therefore, who preach the true doctrines of the gospel, afford no excuse to sinners for neglecting prayer. By preaching the true doctrines of the gospel, they neither directly nor indirectly teach them to neglect praying in private or in public. But are there not many, who have neglected praying, and laid the blame at the preacher's door, who has, in their view, taught them doctrines, which are inconsistent with their duty to pray? The question is a serious one, and ought to be impartially examined. It is very probable, that sinners have been convinced, either experimentally or speculatively, that they are totally depraved, that their total depravity consists in a heart, which is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; and that to offer up the desires of such a heart, is an abomination to the Lord. And from this view of their hearts, they have taught themselves, that it is not their duty to pray. But did their minister ever teach them so? He is not conscious that he ever did, but is conscious that it was their duty always to pray, and not neglect it on account of their total depravity, which affords no excuse for the neglect. If numbers have neglected secret prayer and family prayer, on account of the faithful preaching they have heard on this and other religious subjects,

the preacher knows no other course to take, than to preach the same doctrines, which he has uniformly preached, and leave the solemn consequences. He knows they may be fatal. He trembles at the result. He knows, that if any, on any consideration whatever, cast off fear and restrain prayer before God, that they are pursuing the path to ruin, and that unless they repent and pray, they must be finally lost. But still he must preach the doctrine of total depravity, and condemn all the hopes, and fears, and desires, and prayers of those, who are under the entire dominion of it; and exhort them to repent and pray immediately and acceptably.

Again, as men are bound by nature, conscience, and scripture, to pray always, there is reason to fear, that all who neglect this plain and important religious duty, do neglect all other religious duties. If they break over their strong obligations to this duty, it may well be expected, that they will break over their obligations to every other religious duty. And however fair, and beautiful, and amiable they may be in other respects, they are altogether *irreligious*. This is true of every prayerless person, and equally true of every prayerless family. What then must be the present general character of people? May they properly be considered religious, when they are generally prayerless? or must they not more properly be considered irreligious? What must be the unhappy state of the rising generation, who are brought up in prayerless and irreligious families? And what must be the solemn account, that prayerless families will have to give to God?

This subject now speaks to those, who have never begun to pray. You ought to have began as soon as you knew God, whether earlier or later in life; and it is your present indispensable duty to begin.—This subject speaks to those who have begun to pray, but have fainted and neglected. Have you not been grossly inconsistent? You have once known and felt it to be your duty to pray, and have you ever felt it not to be your duty? or have you ever found an excuse for neglecting, which has satisfied your own conscience? You must then be judged and condemned out of your own mouth. And you can never find peace and rest, until you again pray, and pray aright. You have no time to lose, it may be soon too late to ask, and consequently forever too late to find.

This subject also speaks to to those who have begun to pray, and to pray aright. You have great encouragement always to pray and not to faint. Your prayers, like Daniel's, have been heard, and will still be heard, for yourselves and others. Religion is now lodged in your own hands, and will you suffer it to die, through your neglect? Your duty in this case, is your privilege, and in doing it, you may find great reward in this life, as well as in the life to come. Read the parable, in the 18th chap. of Luke, and learn the powerful efficacy of fervent, persevering prayers. And you will say to yourselves, as Samuel did, "God forbid that we should *cease* to pray for ourselves and others."

Gospel holiness includes an heart broken for sin, an heart broken off from sin, and a perpetual conflict with sin. *Medley.*

For the Christian Magazine.

"THE OUTCASTS OF ISRAEL."

[Concluded from page 278.]

My principal argument to prove the Israelitish origin of the natives of this country, will be derived from a great variety of their *peculiar customs*, relating both to their religious, their social, and their civil concerns.* The Israelites were divided into *tribes*, each of which had a particular emblem, derived from the last blessings of Jacob for his sons. Thus Judah's emblem was a lion, Benjamin's a wolf, Issachar's an ass, and Dan's a serpent. The American Indians are also divided into tribes, in a similar way. They have their wolf tribe, their bear tribe, their tiger tribe, their eagle tribe, and many others. The different tribes of Israel were very particular, in keeping and preserving their respective *genealogies;* and we have it from one who spent forty years among the Indians, that each individual of them assumes some geneological name, and lineally distinguishes himself according to his family.

With the religious customs and institutions of the *Israelites*, all who have studied the Old Testament are familiar. They had their *high-priest*, the duties of whose office were of the most solemn kind, and who attired himself, on particular occasions, in a rich and peculiar dress. So the American Indians have their high-priests, who are inducted into office with purifications and anointings, and who pretend to a special intercourse with the Deity. Like the high-priest in Israel, they make their yearly atonement for the people. On these occasions, they put on their sacred garments, which resemble, in some rude degree, the pontifical dress described in the Old Testament. The servant of the high-priest in Israel was, in Hebrew, denominated *Sagan;* and it is remarkable that the servant of the Indian high-priest is called by precisely this name—*Sagan*. The Indians have also their *inferior priests* and *prophets*, like those which existed among the Jews.

The different tribes of Indians have their *temples*, small indeed, and of rude construction, but still bearing a resemblance to the Hebrew temple. They have their *altars* and *high places*, on which sacrifices are offered to the Deity. Many of the tribes have a mysterious little box or *ark*, answering in design to "the ark of the covenant," into which the common people are never permitted to look. It is carried with them in their wars, and contains some little articles which are esteemed most sacred. In time of peace, it is deposited in a concealed apartment of their temples, as the ancient ark was in the most holy place of the temple in Israel.

The Indians have several annual *feasts*, corresponding to the festivals prescribed by Moses.—They have their feast of *first fruits*. Not a particle of their green corn must be eaten, until a portion of it has been prepared and offered to the Great Spirit.

* It does not comport with the studied brevity of this communication, to quote *authorities* in support of the numerous facts and accounts which have been, and may be, given, I will merely say, that I have stated nothing but on what I regarded as *good* authority; and all who wish to examine for themselves, and to pursue the subject to greater lengths, may consult Adair's "History of the American Indians;" Boudinot's "Star in the West;" and especially Smith's "View of the Hebrews," to which latter work I acknowledge myself chiefly indebted.

They have their feast of *ingathering* or *harvest*. This is celebrated in the autumn, before departing for their winter hunt. They have also a festival very nearly resembling the Jewish *Passover*. Not a bone of the venison must be broken, and whatever is not eaten on the evening of the celebration, must be immediately burned in the fire. At one of these festivals, *booths* are erected for the convenience of the guests, as they were in the ancient feast of tabernacles.

The Indians have a tradition that *circumcision* was once practised among them; but "as their young made a mock of it, it fell into disrepute, and was discontinued." Mr. McKenzie, however, in his travels in the northern parts of America, discovered Indians who he supposed still practised it.

The appearance of the *new moon* was observed in Israel, as a season of special solemnity; and so it is by the American Indians. The Israelites practised a variety of *ablutions* and *anointings*; and so do the Indians. In Israel, the stranger or foreigner was regarded as *impure*, and consequently disqualified for their religious observances; and just so he is now regarded among the Indians.* There were several prescribed occasions, on which the children of Israel separated their females, and others of their own people, from them, as *unclean*; and the Indians do the same. The *lex talionis*—the law of blood for blood, which belonged to the civil code of Israel, is in equal force among the natives of this country.* The *avenger of blood* is the same in both nations. And a likeness of the Israelitish *cities of refuge* have existed, probably in every native tribe of America. The Israelites were forbidden to eat of the *sinew that shrank* in the hollow of the thigh; and no Indian, unless he be a novice or an outlaw, will touch this part of any animal. It was an abomination to the Israelites to eat flesh in its *blood*; and it is equally so to the Indian. The Israelitish customs of washing and anointing the bodies of the *dead*, and indulging in noisy and immoderate grief on their account, have always been practised among the natives of this country. Among the children of Israel, there was a division of animals into the *clean* and the *unclean*; and there are several kinds which the Indian will scarcely allow himself to touch, under the impression that they are unclean.

The Indians' mode of reckoning *time* is almost precisely that of the ancient Hebrews. They begin their year, on the first appearance of the new moon after the vernal equinox. The year is divided into the four seasons, and subdivided into moons or months. The Indian *day*, like that of the Hebrews, begins and ends with the setting of the sun.

The natives of this country bear a resemblance to the Israelites, in some of the *follies* and *vices* which prevailed among that ancient people. The Indians, who have come within the reach of temptation, have, for the most part, been notorious for their ha-

* It is on this account, doubtless, that travellers among the Indians have not been able to acquaint themselves more particularly with their religious customs.

* In this view, it appears not improbable, that the trait of Indian character which has usually been ascribed to a relentless spirit of *revenge*, is no other than the natural result of their established laws, and even of their religion.

bits of *intemperance*. And so, it appears, were the children of Israel. "Woe to the crown of pride, and to the *drunkards of Ephraim*"—to the drunkards of the *ten tribes*.—The Indians are also noted for their attachment to *ornaments;* and so were the Israelites. Let any one read the description of Israelitish ornaments in the 3d chapter of Isaiah —of the chains, the bracelets, the rings, the nose jewels, &c. and he will almost fancy that he sees an American Indian before him, "in full dress."

As the natives of this country are essentially one people, I have not thought it necessary, in speaking of their customs, to confine my attention to any particular tribe. Probably in no *one* tribe, will all the customs that have been mentioned be found to exist. But they will all be found, I think, in the country, among one portion or another of the native population. Indeed the resemblance which has been traced, between the customs of the two nations, might easily be pursued to greater lengths.—But it is time to inquire, how this near and striking resemblance is to be *accounted for*. Where did the native Americans learn these Israelitish customs? Not surely from the light of nature; for the most of them are such as the light of nature never did, and never could teach. They were given to the Israelites, because they were such as no other nation would be likely to learn or imitate, and for the purpose of preserving them a distinct people. How then came so many and so distinct traces of these peculiar customs into the possession of the American Indians?

Several, who could not deny the facts that have been stated, and were unwilling to admit the conclusion to which they lead, have supposed that the Indians must have been instructed by some early *Missionaries*. But it is idle to talk of their having received their national traditions and customs from the instruction of Missionaries. They possessed them, as all rational accounts agree, and possessed them in much greater distinctness and purity than at present, long before their acquaintance with Europeans. Where then did they learn them? From whom did they receive them? —To these questions I can give no answer but this—*the American Indians are themselves Israelites, the dispersed descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel.*

To this conclusion it may be objected, that the Israelites, previously to their dispersion, were an *enlightened people;* and that it is incredible they should relapse into such a state of rudeness and barbarism, as that in which we find the natives of this country. —But were not the natives of this country *once* an enlightened people; and as much so, as the Israelites, at the time of their dispersion? Of this we have incontestable proof, in the remains of cities, and forts, and pyramids, and works of art, with which some parts of America abound. Nor is it difficult to account for these various works of art, on supposition that the natives are the descendants of Israel. When the tribes had crossed the straits of Bhering, and the vast continent of America opened before them, the more civilized and enlightened would naturally associate, and establish themselves in the most fertile and pleasant parts of the country—such, for instance, as the banks of the Ohio and Mississippi, and

the valley of Mexico. Here they would build cities and forts, and exercise the various arts with which they were acquainted. The ruder and more ignorant part of the nation, they would naturally leave behind them, to roam the northern forests, to pursue the chase, and to feast upon the wild animals with which the new world was filled. But as the northern barbarians in Europe once invaded and desolated the cities of the south, so, in the progress of years, these northern hunters would come down upon the cities and plains of their more enlightened brethren, and spread destruction all around them. It was in this way, very probably, that the cities once standing on the banks of some of our large rivers were overthrown, and the forts dispossessed; and that darkness and heathenism were spread over the country.

It is true, not only that the natives of America were once acquainted with the arts, but that the arts with which they were acquainted were essentially *Jewish*. Witness the *pyramids of Mexico*, which are almost precisely similar to those which the Israelites must have seen, and perhaps builded, in Egypt. Witness also the *wells* in the western country, with a large stone upon their mouth, reminding us of those in the Patriarchal age. The Indians on the north-west coast of America have hieroglyphical paintings; and one of the figures painted by them is plainly that of the *Jewish harp*. How came their fathers to be acquainted with this instrument, unless they were of Israelitish origin?

The Indians have a tradition that their fathers formerly possessed what they call "the old *Divine speech*," or, the "*Book of God*;" and that they have lost it.—The late Dr. West of Stockbridge was once told, by an aged Indian, that a great while ago the fathers of his tribe possessed a sacred book; but "as they had not the knowledge of reading it, they concluded it could be of no service to them, and buried it in the grave of one of their Chiefs." The following fact will go to show, that this story of the Indian to Dr. West was not probably a fiction. In a part of Pittsfield, (Mass.) called *Indian hill*, an Indian relick has been, within a few years, dug up, which, on being examined and opened, was found to contain several small pieces of parchment. On these parchments were marks, resembling letters, in some language unknown to the finder. He exhibited them for the inspection of the learned, who perceived at once that the language was Hebrew, and that the writing was no other than several verses from the *Old* Testament.* Here then we have a plain matter of fact, proving for aught I see conclusively, that the natives of this country were once in possession of at least *portions* of the Old Testament; and proving also, with scarcely less conclusiveness, that these natives are "the outcasts of Israel."

How far the evidence which has been exhibited of the Israelitish origin of the American Indians may be deemed satisfactory by my readers, I shall not presume to say. I do not myself call it demonstration; for I do not suppose the subject admits of it. Nor am I so obstinately fixed in my own conclusion, that I cannot relinquish it, whenever I shall

* Those who wish to see a full and satisfactory statement of this fact, will find it in Smith's "View of the Hebrews." pp. 217–225.

t fairly refuted. But I have
ar, at present, of seeing it
ed. So far from this, I am
dent it will gather strength,
ıvestigations into the tradi-
, customs, and relicks of the
ıns are continued, till the
le community comes to have
ɔne mind on the subject.
he consideration, that the na-
inhabitants of our country
"the outcasts of Israel,"
ld add strength and vigor to
:xertions which are making,
ıpart to them the blessings of
ızation and the gospel.—The
e of the *Jews* is exciting
ıg sympathies, and strenuous
tions, in different parts of the
stian world, for the very
reason, that the Jews are
rded as the descendants of
ıham, a remnant of Israel,
a people of distinguished pro-
. But are not the scattered
endants of the ten tribes in
manner the children of Abra-
, a remnant of Israel, and a
le of distinguished promise?
ought not the same interest,
h is felt for the Jews, to be
ılso in behalf of them?
ne subject of civilizing and
stianizing the natives of this
try, (whatever may be their
nal origin,) is one which
t to be deeply interesting to
rican Christians. We have
:n them from their ancient
ts; we possess their lands;
locks and herds graze over
ombs of their fathers. We
y owe them a debt of grati-
; and the best recompense
an possibly make is to send
hem the gospel.—And be-
; if American Christians do
end to them the gospel, what
ıtians will? The pious in
ɔpe can hardly be expected
ɔ it. The Indians seem com-
:d in Providence to our spi-
ritual care; and who will care for their souls, if we do not?—And it may be observed still farther, that the work of evangelizing them has in late years been crowned with distinguished success. No Missions have been more highly prospered, than those that have been established among them. If any thing can be learned, by favoring events in Providence, respecting the pleasure of the Deity, this work has plainly stamped upon it the broad seal of Heaven's approval.

These are reasons in favor of exertions for the spiritual benefit of the American natives, *whatever may be their national origin.* But if they are in fact, as we suppose, "the outcasts of Israel"—the scattered decsendants of the ten tribes; then we may have additional incitements. All the sympathies which we so justly feel for the Jewish race may be extended to them; and in laboring to promote their conversion and salvation, we may be preparing a "present for the Lord of hosts, of a nation scattered and peeled, and terrible from their beginning hitherto, whose land the rivers have spoiled."

P.

For the Christian Magazine.

A FEW GENERAL RULES WHICH MAY ASSIST A YOUNG STUDENT IN DIVINITY.

1. HABITUATE yourself to examine the evidence of *every* thing you believe, without trusting to education, former opinion, or the assertion of others.

2. Begin the study of Divinity at the root, and not at the branches: that is to say, begin at the first principles in Theology, which are few and plain, and afterwards trace them out in their various

consequences, relations, and connexions.

3. In order to fix your first principles, or fundamental doctrines, beside the Bible, read a *few* of the best authors, on each side of the point you would wish to establish.

4. In reading authors, aim more at possessing yourself with their general scheme and principal arguments, than with their particular expressions, and incidental sentiments. And while you labour to retain their ideas, labour to forget their words, which, if retained will tend to prevent your making *their* ideas your *own*. Therefore abound not in extracts.

5. Follow not too strictly the path of any particular divine, or divines; for by *following* you will never overtake them; but endeavor, if possible, to find out some new, nearer, and easier way by which you may get before, and really add some pittance to the common stock of Theological knowledge.

6. Let Divinity be your supreme study, with an eye to which, let all your other reading, study, conversation, and researches be directed.

7. Let your sermon, like a sugar-loaf, begin at a point, and widen and expand to the end.

8. First address the understanding, secondly the conscience, and lastly the passions of your hearers.

9. Endeavor to leave the *subject* of your discourse on the minds of your hearers, rather than a few *striking sentiments* or *expressions*.

10. Take care, in delivery, to stand *behind* and not *before* your subject.

11. Preach *upon* your subject and not *about* it.

THEOPHILUS.

For the Christian Magazine.

CONVERSATION AT AN INN.

Messrs. Editors,—Travelling of late in a certain part of Massachusetts, which shall be nameless, I took lodgings for the night in a very comfortable public house. Soon after my arrival, Rev. Dr. T——, a respectable Unitarian clergyman, called, on the same errand as myself. His face and name were familiar to me, though I was probably unknown to him. Having taken his supper, and rested himself a little, the Doctor fell into the following conversation with his host.

Dr. T. "Well, Col. B——, I understand you are about settling a Minister among you.

Col. B. We are so, indeed. The Society have given him a call, and the ordination is appointed.

Dr. T. Were the Society unanimous in his favor.

Col. B. Why, nearly so. There are several of us who do not like his sentiments; but then he advances them very cautiously, and seems to be accommodating, and we think it best to be quiet for the present.

Dr. T. He is a Calvinist, I suppose.

Col. B. He professes to be; though I have never heard him preach upon the more obnoxious points of Calvinism.

Dr. T. And what are his intentions in respect to ministerial intercourse?

Col. B. O we have been careful to settle that point with him, I assure you. He has told us *explicitly*, that he should never take upon himself to withdraw from any, who had been regularly inducted into the ministry; and that he should expect to maintain a free and friendly intercourse with Unitarians.

Dr. T. You have done well, Colonel, in being explicit with him on that point; and also in encouraging and aiding his settlement. From your account of him, he is *just such a man as we want.* You may be surprised when I assure you, that I think he will do more in behalf of our cause, than though he were a professed Unitarian.

Col. B. I am happy to have your approbation, Doctor; but I am somewhat surprised, I must acknowledge, at your last assertion. Will you be so good as to explain yourself?

Dr. T. I repeat it, my dear sir, we want *just such men*, and *ministers*, as you represent your Pastor elect to be. We want them, in this region, more than we do open Unitarians. There is a strong tendency in the two classes of Congregationalists in this commonwealth to separate—separate, I mean, *in form.* But *we* are not yet prepared for such a separation. It would operate against us. Separated from the great Orthodox community, we should appear few and feeble. We should sink, both in the estimation of others, and in our own. We should be a more palpable object, than we now are, of public odium; and should be less able to resist it. *Our* policy, therefore, is to *keep off* a formal separation, at least for the present. And in doing this, we need the help of just such ministers, as the one you are about to settle. They will serve as mediators—or rather as *links*, to bind the two parties together. They will also serve to keep us in *countenance*, with many who are inclined to reproach us. When *you*, for instance, hear it said, that this or that Unitarian minister does not preach the gospel, and is not fit to preach at all; you can at once silence the allegation, by appealing to the conduct of your minister. 'Our minister is a good man, as all admit; and he thinks that these Unitarians are good men, and good ministers, or he would not suffer them to preach to his people.'——And besides; under the ministry of such a man as you are about to settle, the progress of Unitarianism among you will be not less sure, and probably not less rapid, than though he were a professed Unitarian. If he were a professed Unitarian, your Calvinist folks would be dissatisfied, and most likely would withdraw; and they would draw away a great portion of the people after them. Parties would in this case be formed, and all who had separated would be confirmed in their Calvinistic notions. But in the course you are now pursuing, there will be no difficulty. Your minister will preach very little distinguishing Calvinism himself; and the Unitarian ministers, whom he introduces, will disseminate their principles, as far, and as fast, as they prudently can. Every thing will go on quietly in this way, and—my word for it—your next minister will be a Unitarian, settled, without opposition, over the whole parish.

Col. B. Well, I am happy, Doctor, to hear you talk in this way; but should you not like to be made acquainted with our expected minister?

Dr. T. I should indeed; does he board in the neighborhood?

Col. B. Directly across the street; will you walk over and see him?

Dr. T. I thank you, sir; it would give me much pleasure."

So they took their hats, and went out; and I took my pen and

scribbled down the substance of their conversation—deeply sighing over the weakness of those brethren, who thus suffer themselves to be made the dupes of designing men; and who become the mere tools of partisans, whom themselves can scarcely consider in any other light, than that of "*enemies to the cross of Christ.*"

I only add, that, as the conversation above given was not a private one, it is here submitted to your disposal. It needs no comment. W.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAP. XI.

THEN, after they had walked in the garden, and partaken of its delicious fruits, and been regaled with the odours from the beds of spices, they returned to the house, and resumed their conversation, as follows:

Ardent. There is one thing which seems to promise well for the interests of true Pilgrims in the present and succeeding generations; I mean, the efforts which are made at this day to send the gospel to the destitute, by circulating the King's statute book, by educating pious young men to be qualified for ambassadors of the King to his rebellious subjects, by sending forth those ambassadors to every part of the world, and by training up children in the knowledge of the scriptures.

Charity. This is, indeed, a noble work, and it rejoices my heart to see it go on so prosperously. I have long mourned over the darkness and delusion, the ignorance and the sin of a perishing world. I have lamented the indifference which has so long prevailed, on this subject, among the professed disciples of our Lord, and rejoice to see them beginning to awake to its importance. But the efforts which have been yet made, in comparison with what needs to be done, have been next to nothing. They must be vastly increased, or the gospel will never, by these means, be preached to all nations. They are yet scarcely sufficient to maintain the ground which christianity now occupies.

Ard. Doubtless they will be vastly increased. Who would have thought, thirty years ago, that so much would have been accomplished as has been done already?

Char. I hope they will be vastly increased. But in order to the permanent increase and prosperity of the work, it is necessary that the true nature of the gospel should be better understood, and its true spirit more extensively prevail. Many causes have operated to promote the work hitherto, which cannot be expected to operate permanently. The spirit of the gospel is a spirit of disinterested benevolence. It leads us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and to give up ourselves, with all that we have, and all that we are, for the promotion of the common cause. The primitive disciples of our Lord felt and acted thus; and then the great work went on rapidly. When christians shall again generally feel and act thus, we may expect the work will go on again, in a similar manner.

Ard. And is it not this spirit, which has produced all the change that has taken place in modern times? What else can have contributed to it?

Char. This spirit has doubtless actuated many, and been a principal cause of the change. But if we should ascribe it wholly to this, and form our expectations of its continuance accordingly, we should expose ourselves to a disappointment that might have a very discouraging effect upon us. Some have aided the work, as I said, from pure disinterested regard to the glory of God and the best good of their fellow men. The efforts of such will no doubt be continued. But others have been influenced by various motives, which arose from the circumstances of the moment, and cannot be expected to continue. Some have been influenced by the love of novelty. Their attention has been attracted to the various benevolent enterprises of the present day, because they were new. When they cease to be new, that interest ceases. Some have been influenced by sympathy. The miseries of those destitute of the gospel have been set before them in glowing colors, and have deeply affected them for a time. But these things, by being often repeated, and becoming familiar, cease to produce the same effect. Some have been influenced by the hope of immediate and great success. Their expectations have been raised high, and they have anticipated a share in the glory of so great a work, and a participation in the triumph of its complete success. A few trials and disappointments will cool the ardor of such, and sink them into despondency and inaction. Some have been influenced by a regard for their reputation. They wish to be considered as standing high among christians, and have seen that while the work is popular, they must be forward in it, in order to maintain their character. When it becomes less popular, they will be less forward. Some have been influenced by the opinions and example of others. Many are guided by what others think and do, instead of being guided by the bible. When those whom they follow shall become cool towards this work, they will become cool also. Some have been influenced by a personal regard for the individuals who are employed or are to be employed as ambassadors of the King. When that motive ceases, their interest in the work will cease. And many, no doubt, have given something to aid the work, because they have been solicited to do it, merely to free themselves from the trouble of solicitation. Such have felt no interest in the work itself, and will be more and more set against it, as they are repeatedly called upon to contribute for its advancement. Some, perhaps, have been influenced by self-righteous motives, by the desire of increasing their substance, or the fear of losing what they have. But those who are perfectly selfish, never assist a benevolent enterprise for the sake of doing good; and will find means of eluding the force of those motives which are urged in its favor. It is to be expected that those who understand and love the gospel, and are actuated by its benevolent spirit, will be persevering and active in their efforts for the spread of the gospel. But the aid which has been received from others, from the causes which I have mentioned, will not be likely to be continued, and ought not to be much relied upon.

Thoughtful. Is it not, then, greatly to be desired, on this account as well as others, that

christians should be better acquainted with that system of doctrines which teaches a disinterested religion?

Char. Certainly. If indifference to the truth prevails, the cause of christian benevolence must decline. Men cannot be expected to make great sacrifices to maintain or spread that gospel which they do not understand nor love.

Ard. I have known some who appeared to be very active in promoting the cause of christian benevolence, who yet manifested but little inclination to inquire into doctrinal truth, and but little attachment to any set of opinions.

Char. The reasons which I have already mentioned may account for it, in part. And if there are some, who feel and act out, more true benevolence than their system teaches, they are probably persons who do not think much, and are under the influence of some prejudice. Unhappily, some who profess an attachment to the true gospel scheme, do not feel it in their hearts. They *talk* of benevolence, but do not manifest it by their life. One such example does great injury to the cause of truth, and serves to prejudice many against it.

Th. I perceive that I was right, then, in telling that imposter who assumes your name, that "Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the *truth*."

Char. Certainly. I rejoice in the truth, on account of its own excellence. I rejoice in it also, because it is the appointed means of promoting the conversion and sanctification of sinners. And I am grieved at the prevalence of error, because it is the means of leading men to destruction. As I wish well to all men, I wish that they may be "begotten by the word of *truth*—sanctified through the *truth*—have repentance to the acknowledging of the *truth*—purify their souls in obeying the *truth*—and attain salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the *truth*." And I wish to see the whole world converted to the belief, and love, and practice of the truth. To be indifferent to truth, is directly contrary to my nature. And she that assumes my name, and professes so much indifference as to what sentiments men embrace, does it only to conceal her enmity to the truth, that she may the more effectually lead men away from it. She may feel indifferent which of the various schemes of error are embraced; but she hates the truth with all her heart, and sometimes she will avow it. She commonly professes this indifference, in the company of those who believe the truth, that she may conceal her true character, and gain their confidence. She knows that if she can weaken their attachment to the truth, and lead them to embrace her favorite maxim, that it is of no importance what men believe, she has already gained much. For if she should fail of success (which is not likely) in leading them to renounce the truth altogether, and embrace error, yet, by destroying their attachment to the truth, she prevents the influence which they would otherwise exert against her, and strengthens the hands of those who are more actively engaged in promoting her cause. And, on some accounts, it is most for the promotion of her cause, to have some such persons among the friends of truth. While they are ranked among the friends of truth, they will retain an influence there, which they would lose if they became its open enemies. And having embraced her max-

ims, they can propagate them with success; and thus prepare the way for her own influence to be more directly exerted.

Ard. It is often objected against giving any thing to promote objects of benevolent enterprize, that we ought to save it for our children. And it is written, "if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Char. The connexion in which that is written, shows what it means. The primitive churches made provision for the support of those members who were unable to provide for themselves. But if any man, who was able to provide for his aged parents, should throw them upon the funds of the church, it would be such a proof of his covetousness as would destroy his christian character. The passage is against covetousness; but it is often made use of as a cloak of covetousness.

Ard. But how shall the objection be answered?

Char. It is not the duty of parents to let their children suffer, in order to give away what is needed to supply their actual wants. But children who enjoy health, and are trained to habits of industry and self-denial, do not need to have property laid up for them. It more frequently proves a curse than a blessing. Covetous parents commonly have profligate children. And the latter waste an estate quicker than the former accumulated it. Those children are more likely to do well for themselves, as well as for the public, who are trained up by benevolent parents, than those who are trained up by covetous ones. Those who are taught habits of industry, prudence, self-denial, generosity, and public-spiritedness, will not be likely to come to want. Such habits will gain them friends and employment; and, with the blessing of God, will insure success in their enterprizes. But those who are trained up to the habit of making their own gratification their only object, will be destitute of the qualifications which are most necessary to success in the world. And if they have been led to depend upon a patrimony for support, rather than on their own industry, it is so much the worse for them. I think, therefore, that, if parents studied the good of their children in this life only, and had no regard for the great cause of christian benevolence, it would be much wiser for them to give away what is not needed, than to hoard it up for those that are to come after.

Th. It is also objected, that what is spent in sending the gospel to the heathen is thrown away, because they are better without the gospel than with it.

Char. That objection can be made by none but such as do, at heart, disbelieve the gospel itself. If the gospel is chargeable with doing more hurt than good, then it is a curse to the world, and is not true.

Th. Perhaps those who make the objection would not admit this consequence. But they think the heathen are as likely to be saved in their present state, as they would be if they had the gospel.

Char. The present state of the heathen world is no better than it was in the days of the apostles. They labored to spread the gospel among those who were then heathens, that they might thereby save souls from everlasting perdition. Those who make this objection, condemn the conduct of the apostles.

After this conversation, the pilgrims were taken to the library, and shown the records of the house, in which they found the history of many excellent pilgrims who had gone this way before them. So the company had much conversation on what those pilgrims had met with in their travels, on the dangers they had escaped, the difficulties they had surmounted, and the deliverances they had experienced, and also the snares into which some of them had fallen through neglect of watchfulness and prayer. And Piety, Prudence, and Charity, made many remarks on those incidents, and the use which the pilgrims ought to make of them for their own instruction and consolation.

And when they had spent some time in this way, both pleasantly and profitably, they returned, and sat down to supper. Now the supper, I perceived, was the principal meal of this family; and though served up in a plain and simple manner, it was prepared of more costly materials, even such as were brought from a far country, and were bought with a price far exceeding in value the wealth of the Indies. There was set before them a lamb, of the firstlings of the flock, a male without blemish and without spot, prepared for them to feed upon without a bone of him being broken. Their bread was of such as came down from heaven, and like that which fed the Israelites in the wilderness. Their drink was water from the river of life which flows from the paradise of God, and wine made from the first ripe clusters of Eshcol. Their food was seasoned with the salt that never loses its savor, and spices from the garden of king Solomon.

So the pilgrims sat down to this feast with great delight, and the food was sweet to their taste. Moreover, at the table they had much discourse about the Lord of the way, and what he had done for pilgrims. They spoke of his illustrious birth, his exalted character, his wonderful condescention, his bitter sufferings, and cruel death. They discoursed also of his resurrection on the third day, his ascension to his Father's right hand, the wisdom and equity of the government he is now exercising, and of his coming again in the glory of his Father, to execute judgment upon his enemies, and receive his friends to be partakers of his glory. They discoursed also of the manner of life which it becomes those to lead who are admitted to these high privileges, and allowed to indulge these glorious hopes. And after having renewed their solemn pledges to be faithful to each other, and faithful to the Lord of the way, and having offered their thanksgivings to their Lord for the enjoyment of this refreshing season, they concluded by singing the following hymn:

"Lord, at thy table I behold
The wonders of thy grace:
But most of all admire, that I
Should find a welcome place.

I, that am all defiled with sin,
A rebel to my God;
I, that have crucified his Son,
And trampled on his blood.

What strange, surprising grace is this,
That such a soul has room!
My Saviour takes me by the hand,
My Jesus bids me come.

With trembling faith, and bleeding heart,
Lord, we accept thy love:
'Tis a rich banquet we have had,
What will it be above?"

Then, after the company had discoursed together of these things a long while, and had committed themselves to the protection of Him that never slumbers

nor sleeps, they retired to rest; and the pilgrims were lodged in the chamber of peace, the same in which the pilgrim Christian had slept when he was there.

BUNYANUS.

THE EFFECT OF A PEOPLE ON THE MINISTRY.

A THIN, heavy, sleepy, fruitless people, stops the mouth, straitens the gifts, deadens the spirit of a pastor; and a people enlarged in their gifts and affections, carry a preacher beyond himself. I have heard much talk of barren ministers. Shall I tell you? A barren people make a barren ministry; a cold auditory, a cold sermon; a dead parish, a dumb minister. Nothing shuts our mouths, and silences us, so much as our own auditories.

R. Harris.

For the Christian Magazine.

Review.

UNITARIANISM SOUND DOCTRINE.—*A Sermon preached at Waltham, at the Ordination of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, Feb. 15, 1826. By Nathaniel Whitman, Minister of Billerica.*

[Continued from page 268.]

WE have done with Mr. W.'s argument. But there are other things in his Sermon which we feel inclined to notice. Our remarks in the present number will be confined, principally, to the subject of *Unitarian Charity;* upon which our Author, like most other writers of the same class, speaks with freedom, and much apparent complacency. We cannot but think it a great unhappiness, to say nothing more of the fact, that Unitarians are so much more disposed to claim for themselves the amiable virtue of christian charity, than other denominations are to acknowledge that it, in any peculiar degree, belongs to them. While we have observed the self-complacency and boldness, with which they have claimed the merit of being truly and almost exclusively charitable; the following sage precept of the wise man has forcibly occurred to our minds. "Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Mr. W. has occupied nearly four pages of his sermon, with the subject of Unitarian charity, and Trinitarian uncharitableness. But if Unitarians are as much more charitable than others, as they pretend, there is certainly no necessity of their trumpeting their own praise. The world will doubtless do them justice on this subject. And if it is a fact, as a very respectable proportion of the community already believe, that they have no peculiar claims to this excellence, all their efforts to monopolize its honours, will ultimately be in vain. But our readers shall hear Mr. W. on this subject.

"Having spoken with freedom of the Trinitarian System, I feel it to be incumbent on me to disclose with equal freedom our views and feeling with respect to the advocates of this system."

"We wish it, then, to be distinctly understood by the public, that we deny to no one the christian name, privileges, and hopes, merely because

he is a Trinitarian. We judge systems by one rule, and characters by another. The truth or falsehood of systems we determine by their conformity or opposition to reason and scripture. The goodness or badness of character, we determine by the goodness or badness of conduct."

Reason and scripture are indeed a good rule by which to determine the truth or falsehood of systems; and, we have always supposed, as good a rule by which to determine the goodness and badness of character. But Mr. W. says, "We judge systems by one rule, and characters by another." We should think so. Whether reason and scripture are the invariable rule by which Unitarians try systems, we shall not now stop to inquire. We can belive them, however, when they say they have another for character. "The goodness or badness of character, we determine by the goodness or badness of conduct." Very well; but how is the goodness or badness of conduct determined? We had always supposed, as character is made up of conduct, that there was as much need of a rule to determine the goodness or badness of conduct, as to determine the goodness or badness of character, or, as to determine the truth, or falsehood, of a system. And it is now entirely beyond our power to conceive how the goodness or badness of characters can be determined, without bringing the conduct which constitutes them, to the test of reason and scripture. But by making conduct, the rule, by which to determine the goodness or badness of character, and bringing conduct itself to no test or criterion, Unitarians have a very fair opportunity for the exercise of their charity. It is a very easy thing for them, in this way, to cherish a good opinion of any man, for whom they wish to cherish such an opinion. This is certainly a very convenient thing. And by refusing to bring conduct and character to the scriptural test, they can avoid the unpleasant, and what they esteem very uncharitable conclusions, to which they must otherwise often be led, respecting the characters of men who disbelieve and reject the doctrines of the gospel. Disregarding the scriptures as a test of character, they can fellowship any man as a christian, who will admit that "Jesus is the Christ," even although he denies, as did Priestley and Belsham, nearly every other essential doctrine of the gospel. They can even believe that Trinitarians are christians, although their system, as Mr. W. says, "is irreconcileably opposed to the word of God," and "leads to a denial of the Supreme Deity of the Father," and "shakes to its centre the whole christian fabric." Although the Apostle has expressly declared, that "idolaters—shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" and Trinitarians are supposed by Unitarians to be idolaters; yet, keeping clear of the scriptures as a test of character, they can very courteously extend the hand of fellowship to all who profess to believe in Christ, and wish the public distinctly to understand, that they "deny to no one the christian name, privileges, or hopes, merely because he is a Trinitartan."

Unitarians believe that Trinitarianism is "*another gospel;*" and, Mr. W. says, "it shakes to its centre the whole christian fabric;" and, they all know, that Paul has said, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel, unto you than

that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed;" yet, by making one rule for the trial of systems, and another for character, they can, with much good nature and great apparent plausibility, say, with Mr. W.: "Sentiments which we may deem erroneous and pernicious, may be embraced by men, whom we regard as wise and good. In this imperfect state, under the most favourable circumstances, we all see as through a glass darkly in many respects. In addition to this it is to be remembered, that we have all suffered more or less from our exposure to traditionary errors. With these views, we can consistently oppose as erroneous and pernicious a system, while we acknowledge as learned, sensible, and *good* men, its zealous advocates." What a pity that Paul had not seen that there was one rule for the trial of systems, and another for characters? He might then, while "he consistently opposed as erroneous and pernicious" "*another gospel*;" have acknowledged as learned, and sensible, and *good* "its zealous advocates;" especially if they were "angels from heaven," whose conduct he must of course suppose was good. How much more charitable would the venerable Apostle have appeared, and how much more worthy of his dignified and sacred office, would he really have been, if he had omitted the latter clause of this passage, and, instead of using the harsh and unfeeling denunciation, "Let him be *accursed*," against the false teacher; had, like the more judicious and enlightened Unitarians of the present day, acknowledged him, although in an error, to be "learned, sensible, and *good*." The only apology which we can make for this venerable man is, he did not know that there is one rule for the trial of systems, and another for character. And if some Trinitarians, are thought to resemble him in their uncharitableness, we hope the same thing will be deemed a sufficient excuse for them also.

But although Mr. W. appears, in the passage above quoted, to extend his charity to Trinitarians in general; yet he lets us know, that he feels much more cordial and respectful toward those who are the least influenced by their peculiar principles.

"Much more do we feel it to be our duty to acknowledge, as entitled to this character, those whose attachment to a traditionary system is so feeble as to afford little scope for the operation of its evil tendencies. In this light it is that Unitarians regard a part of the Trinitarian clergy. Their preaching and their practice are mainly according to the simplicity of gospel truth and duty. Their Trinitarian creed, floating on the surface of their minds, is comparatively inoperative. Its evil tendencies are essentially counteracted by their good sense and sound learning, their consistent protestantism and genuine piety, their obedience to Christ and charity to men. Ministers of this character we cannot but esteem, and love, and venerate."

Is it then true, that a man, who acts inconsistently with his own principles, is more to be "esteemed, and loved, and venerated," than those who carry their principles into practice? We believe, that Mr. W. is among the few, even of Unitarians, who would say this. For our own part, we cannot forbear to say, that there is no trait of character which we more highly admire, than that of consistency. If we know a man to be a Unitarian, we do not love or respect him the less for acting agreeable to his principles. On the other hand, we despise the man, who

sincerely believes the principles of Unitarians, but suffers them to have no important influence upon his conduct. And as for those Trinitarians, whose "creed floats only upon the surface of their minds, and is comparatively inoperative," it is certainly doing them no injustice to say, they are either to be pitied for their weakness, or detested for their hypocrisy. But perhaps, we do not understand Mr. W. It is possible he means, by a man's "creed floating upon the surface of his mind," that he does not fully believe it. He thinks about it, but does not fully and understandingly receive it. A Trinitarian, then, who neither understands nor believes his own creed, is the man "of good sense, and sound learning," &c. whom Mr. W. "esteems, and loves, and venerates." It is not, indeed, strange, that such a man's creed should be "comparatively inoperative." Those who are undecided in their principles, must of course be inefficient in their conduct. But it is a little strange, that characters of this description, should be peculiarly the objects of Mr. W.'s affection and esteem.

"We rejoice, indeed," says Mr. W. "in the persuasion that this class of our Trinitarian brethren," viz. those whose Trinitarian creed floats upon the surface of their minds, and is comparatively inoperative, the evil tendencies of which are essentially counteracted by other principles, "are prepared to say with the independent and catholic Doddridge, sooner than refuse to hold communion with Unitarians, as such, we will resign our ministry." It is then those, who either do not understand their own creed, or who if they do understand it, do not act according to it, that Mr. W. expects will hold communion with Unitarians. This is indeed a fine compliment to that class of Trinitarians whom he so highly esteems. It carries an irresistible implication, that in holding communion with Unitarians, they act in opposition to their own principles. It seems that although some Trinitarians believe that they may in perfect consistency with their peculiar principles, hold communion with Unitarians; yet Unitarians do not believe this themselves. We know that Dr. Priestley and other English Unitarians had said what plainly implies this, but we did not suppose that Unitarians in this country were ready so explicitly to avow it. Heretofore the unpardonable sin of Trinitarians has been, that they were generally unwilling to admit that Unitarians were christians, and to hold communion with them as such. But here we find, that those who have raised the loudest cry against them on this account, fully believe that they cannot do it in consistency with their principles; and still they tell us, that those who will do it, are objects of their peculiar respect, love, and veneration. The friends of Dr. Doddrige will hardly thank Mr. W. for this compliment paid to his independence and catholicism.

In the very paragraph in which Mr. Whitman so evidently admits that Trinitarians cannot, consistently with their own principles, hold communion with Unitarians, he complains bitterly of their uncharitableness in this respect. He speaks of "that course of reprobation and exclusion which has been and which still is, so systematically, and so zealously pursued against them." What "course of reprobation

and exclusion?" If he means here to refer to past ages, when persecution for religious sentiments by fire and faggot, was the order of the day, we can inform him that in those days Unitarians could persecute as well as others. But if he refers, as we suppose he does, to the conduct of Trinitarians in this country, we ask, what "course of reprobation and exclusion have they so zealously and systematically pursued against Unitarians?" But we need not wait for an answer. He doubtless means to allude to the fact, that Trinitarians, most of them at least, do not believe that Unitarians are christians, and that they refuse to hold communion with them as such; and that they have, moreover, had the audacity to say, openly, what they believe on this subject, and to regulate their conduct accordingly. This is doubtless the point of their offending. This is the length and breadth of their crime, charitably represented by Mr. W. as "a course of reprobation and exclusion." Now we shall not, in this number, attempt to settle the great question, how far a person may be in an error and yet be a christian; or the equally difficult one, how far it is proper for christians to hold communion with those whose piety is doubtful. But if Mr. W. believes, as he has very clearly intimated, that Trinitarians cannot, in consistency with the peculiarities of their system, hold communion with Unitarians, why does he blame them for declining it? Is it not in all respects as proper, that Trinitarians should be indulged in their belief; that Unitarianism is another gospel, and consequently that Unitarians who understandingly receive it are not christians; as it is that Unitarians should be indulged in their belief that Jesus Christ is a mere creature? Is one of these opinions to be tolerated, and not the other? And are the advocates of one of them to be suffered to act agreeably to it without reproach, while those who presume to conform to the other in their practice, are to be perpetually represented as destitute of charity, branded with the name of bigots and intolerants?

We shall not give ourselves the trouble to maintain the fact that Trinitarians are as charitable as Unitarians. For the sake of meeting Mr. W. on his own ground entirely, we shall allow that Unitarians have about them a certain something called charity, which is not seen in an equal degree in Trinitarians. But we have a few things to say on the subject of this kind of charity, which we think the public will do well to consider.

1. The charity in which Unitarians are supposed to excel Trinitarians, is primarily, if we understand it, a favourable opinion of the piety of others, formed and cherished without regard to their reception or rejection of the peculiar doctrines of the gospel. 2. When speaking of the importance of christian charity, Unitarians generally leave the thing entirely undefined, so that more or less may be understood by it, as occasion requires. 3. This charity is a different thing from that which is required in the Bible. The charity here required is disinterested love. Charity to men, the only charity to men which the Bible requires, is that disinterested love to them, which is inculcated in these words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." 4. That favourable opinion of another's piety, formed

and cherished without regard to his reception or rejection of the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, which appears to us to be the essence of Unitarian charity, is *contrary* to the Bible. The Bible does not authorize us to believe that those are christians, who understandingly reject the peculiar doctrines of the gospel. 5. This charity of christians is inconsistent with other sentiments which they often avow. For instance, Mr. W. has expressed his belief, that many of those whom he *charitably* receives as christians, "*would*, if they had it in their power, bar against Unitarians—the *celestial Paradise*." 6. This kind of charity, although lavished upon Trinitarians as well as others, does them very little if any good.

We solicit the attention of our readers to a few facts illustrative of the truth of this last assertion.

1. The charity of Unitarians does not prevent their attributing to Trinitarians the *basest of motives*. We have more than once heard them charged with a disposition to burn at the stake all those who will not receive their sentiments. An Unitarian "Layman," in attempting to chastise Trinitarians for their uncharitableness, represents Calvin in this light, and charges his followers with the same spirit. His words are these. "Their master would never suffer any one to question his doctrines, under pain of the fagot. He wished to dethrone the Pope, only to put the tiara on his own head. His disciples in this country, and in this alone, *retain the same spirit*." With his mantle of charity over Trinitarians, Mr. W. kindly represents their opinions as the result "of *reasoning pride*." "And while he professes to cherish toward them no hostile feelings," and "to doubt not that they think they are doing God service," he says, they "*would*, had they the power, bar against us the sacred desk, the Table of the Lord, and the *Celestial Paradise*, merely because we are Unitarians." This, we think, is about as much as to deny that Trinitarians are christians.

2. The charity of Unitarians does not prevent their applying to Trinitarians the most reproachful *names* and *epithets*. Dr. Priestley and other English Unitarians call them "*Polytheists*," "*Idolaters*," and "*Blasphemers*." Mr. W. calls them "*ambitious* and *domineering* Ecclesiastics." He also represents them as "*invaders* of the prerogative of Zion's Lord," and charges them with having "usurped" his "authority." Even Dr. Channing, who, to use the words of his opponent, "had shown himself violent for charity," and "fierce for moderation," evidently has Trinitarians in view, when he speaks of "*denouncers*," under the influence of *a spirit of persecution*," which though it has given up its halter and faggot, yet breathes *venom* from its lips, and *secretly blasts* what it cannot *openly destroy*." Trinitarians are so often reproached by Unitarians as "ignorant," "bigoted," "intolerant," and "enthusiastic," that these epithets have become things of course, in their conversation and writings. Now this language may be consistent with charity; but it is a kind of charity which does its hapless subjects no kind of good.

3. The charity of Unitarians does not make Trinitarians the objects of their affections. When their professions of charity to Trinitarians are the highest, their feelings are often evidently cold, if not hostile to its objects. They

often acknowledge them to be christians, when if looks, or actions, or even words can be interpreted, they love them no better, than they do those who are not christians. Nor indeed do they so much. We are altogether mistaken, if we have not seen many instances, in which Unitarians, with the profession of charity to individual Trinitarians, have still manifested a much greater cordiality to avowed Deists, than to these objects of their charity.

4. The charity of Unitarians does not secure to Trinitarians their union and friendly co-operation in the support and enjoyment of the word and ordinances of the gospel. It is true, they very frequently unite with them in these things. But it is generally, if not invariably, when they are so small a minority, that any attempt at separation, would evidently be to their own disadvantage. Whenever they become sufficiently numerous in a place to make any successful opposition to Trinitarians, they generally establish worship for themselves, purely Unitarian; and if, by any art or management, they are able to gain possession of meeting houses or funds, they apply them to the support of Unitarianism, even although these may be the fruit of the labour and bounty of Trinitarians, for the support and propagation of their own faith. We know, indeed, that Unitarians in this country are now desirous of communion with Trinitarians. But we are not satisfied, that this is the effect of cordiality of feeling. It may be policy merely. Should circumstances so change that they could view it as much for their interest to separate from Trinitarians, as they now do to unite with them, we suspect that many of them would begin to doubt the lawfulness of communion with idolaters. We are led to think so, not only from a view of the nature of the case, but from the fact that Unitarians in England have already advocated a separation. "Dr. Priestley says, if there ever was any such thing as *Idolatry* it is paying religious worship to any other than the one only living and true God; and if it be of any consequence to preserve inviolate the first article of all revealed religion, viz. the unity of God and the exclusive worship of him, (which was the one great object of the Jewish religion, and continues to be so in the christian,) it must be incumbent on us to frequent no society of christians, however pious and sincere they may be, if we be convinced that they err in so essential an article of faith as this. It is innocent in them who are ignorant, and act agreeably to their consciences; but it is criminal in us who know better. There are no doubt differences in lighter matters which may be borne with in members of the same society; but if *any* difference of opinion, and practice, will justify a *separation*, it must be *this*."

Now we do not suppose that Mr. W. and his brethren in New England, are prepared to unite with this Apostle of Unitarianism, in all this language of exclusion. But if Mr. W. has fairly represented their principles, they must, if they will follow them out in all their consequences, take precisely the same ground. For, while he says of Trinitarians, "We should rejoice to meet them on gospel-ground," he adds, "we cannot consent to meet them on any *other*." Now we know that with him, *Unitarianism* is gospel-ground. From the following pas-

sage in his sermon, we learn that they, and they only, in his estimation, are true worshippers. "It is thus put beyond a doubt, that those who would be true worshippers, must worship as the Supreme Being, the *Father only.*" It is for Mr. W. to *reconcile* these passages, with others in the sermon, in which he, in behalf of himself and brethren, so kindly offers fellowship and communion with Trinitarians. Here is enough to teach Trinitarians, that they have no assurance from the charity of Unitarians of their union and friendly co-operation in the support and enjoyment of the word and ordinances of the gospel. Nor

5. Does this charity give Trinitarians any assurance of honorable and just treatment by Unitarians, in regard to the enjoyment of their privileges and rights. From such lofty pretensions to christian charity, as we are perpetually hearing from the lips of Unitarians, we should expect that by them, every fair, and honorable, and just principle of social and religious intercourse, would be sacredly regarded. It is not, indeed, strange, that bigoted, intolerant, and persecuting Trinitarians, should frequently trample upon the laws of decency and propriety, and attempt to deprive those, to whom they so rudely deny the name of christian, of some of their dearest rights and privileges. But surely, of Unitarians we might "hope better things." But alas! we are disappointed. Unitarians can, not only call as hard names, manifest as much ill nature, become as intolerant in their spirit, and as exclusive in their measures as Trinitarians, but, with as little ceremony and as little apparent remorse, violate the principles of fair and honourable dealing, and wrest from their fellow-creatures their dearest rights and privileges. We could give many examples of this. But for the sake of brevity, we confine ourselves to one or two. Let any one read the following extract from the London Congregational Magazine, and say if he can, that what we here assert is not true. "We have lately received various letters from *Geneva*, which show that christians in that once highly favoured, but now apostate city, are at present placed in a very critical situation. Most of our readers are acquainted with the awakening which took place there about ten years ago, through the blessing that rested on the labours of Mr. Haldane, among the Theological students of the University. Shortly after that period, the "*Venerable Company*" of pastors took alarm at the rapid growth of *Methodism*;* and the appearance of it among some of the most distinguished of their own body greatly increased their anxiety. They saw that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to turn out of the church those who had obtained a regular place among themselves, but they resolved to use their utmost efforts to prevent any from becoming thereafter members of the "Company." Their first step was to draw up certain articles prohibiting any minister to preach on the Divinity of our Lord, original sin, and other fundamental doctrines. They refused ordination to any of the students who would not subscribe, and in consequence many were rejected.

"M. Malan, not having yet obtained admission into the company of pastors, although he had been regularly ordained, was made the next object of attack.

* In many parts of Europe, all vital religion is reproachfully denominated Methodism.

Our readers are generally aware of the persecution which that undaunted champion of the cross of Christ, has at various times been called to endure. They know that he has been deposed from his office as regent of the College, deprived of his ministerial character in the church, and that he only is indebted to the indulgence of the government for the degree of toleration he has enjoyed in being suffered to preach in a chapel which has been built for him without the walls. Here, however, he has not been left unmolested, but has been subjected to every injury and petty insult which the Arian, Socinian, and Pelagian ministers could invent, to gratify their malignant feelings against the man who dared so faithfully, so eloquently, and so successfully to preach in the midst of opposition and scorn, salvation by Jesus Christ, perfect man, and perfect God. M. Malan, although the most distinguished, was not the only victim, and the story of Empetaz, Gonties, Gyt, Guers, &c. would present another picture of injurious, and vexatious persecution exerted against bold and faithful, though unoffending witnesses for the truth.

"Such had continued to be the state of affairs till within the last few months, when the enmity of the Geneva pastors against the truth, seemed to have gained fresh strength. The increasing numbers which frequented the preaching of M. Malan, the continual instances that were occurring of conversion through his instrumentality, and the blessing which attended the ministry of Messrs. Empetaz, Guers, &c. seemed more and more to arouse their indignation. Their animosity was in a special manner directed against M. Gausen, one of their own number, who, ever since he was brought to know the truth about ten years ago, has not ceased to labour with unceasing assiduity and distinguished success in the vineyard of the Lord. M. Gausen was the last summer formally excluded every pulpit in Geneva, except his own at Satigny, and it seems doubtful whether his situation as a pastor, and his connexion with some of the first familes at Geneva, will continue to protect this faithful minister of Christ.

"M. Chausiere, one of the Arian or Socinian pastors, also preached a most violent sermon against the *Momiers* or Methodists, whom he attacked with the most unmeasured warmth, and represented them as enemies to the State. This sermon had the effect of exasperating the populace to such a degree, that it was not safe for any of the evangelical preachers to be seen in the streets. M. Guers was stoned in one of the public squares, and narrowly escaped with his life; and M. Malan's house was also attacked. It is but just to the government, however, to observe, that they gave no sanction to these acts of violence, and when the writer of this notice was himself at Geneva last autumn, there was a guard of gens d' armes stationed every evening near the houses of M. Malan, and M. Guers. In the mean time every attempt was made to calumniate and traduce the christians at Geneva. Every lie was invented, and greedily propagated through the medium of the newspapers, for the purpose of pouring on them obloquy and contempt. If a person committed suicide, it was said he had heard a sermon from one of the Momiers. If a person became deranged, his disorder was attributed to the same cause, and even the English newspapers

have copied into their columns these baseless fabrications.

"But affairs at Geneva wear, it seems, a still more critical aspect than before. It seems that Mr. Bost, a preacher who was formerly excluded from the church at Geneva, and who is well known abroad for his uncommon talent, zeal, and boldness, as well as for the extraordinary blessing that has attended his labours, especially in Germany, published an answer to the above-mentioned sermon of Mr. Chausiere. We have not seen Mr. Bost's pamphlet, but understand it displayed much ability, and contained a very masterly exposure of the futility of the charges brought against the *Momiers* by M. Chausiere. The "venerable company" at Geneva were, however, much enraged at the boldness of Mr. Bost, and determined if possible to crush him. A prosecution was commenced against him by the public prosecutor, who charged him with describing the pastors at Geneva as a *sect* in the christian world who denied some of the leading doctrines of the gospel. For this alleged crime, he desired that Mr. Bost should be imprisoned for two years, and pay a fine of 2000 florins." It is added, that Mr. Bost pleaded his own cause, that his defence was admirable, and that he was acquitted to the great mortification of the clergy.

We do not quote this passage to show what Unitarians in this country are disposed to do; but to show what Unitarianism has done, even in the nineteenth century, where the *majority* has been under its influence. What they would do, were they the majority in this country, we will not venture to predict. We only say, their *charity*, of which they so loudly boast, gives us no assurance that our dearest rights would not be wantonly sacrificed.

We should think that the people in Waltham, had by this time learned that Unitarian charity is not always attended with every thing that is fair, and honorable, and lovely. What has there taken place in regard to the dismission of Mr. Harding, and the settlement of Mr. Whitman, has taught some of them, effectually, that to enjoy the quiet and peaceable possession of their privileges, is quite a different thing from being embraced in the arms of Unitarian charity. We know, indeed, that according to the terms of Mr. Harding's settlement, his Society had a right to dismiss him, when two thirds of the legal voters should express a wish for the dissolution of the connexion between him and them. Every one will perceive, however, that this right might be honorably or dishonorably, charitably or uncharitably used. Both Mr. Harding and his friends, had reason to expect, that the solemn act of his consecration to the ministry in that place, would not be trifled with,—that the connexion between him and his people would continue, until there were good *reasons* for its dissolution; reasons which did not exist at the time of his ordination. The truth of this remark will at once be perceived, by the supposition that the people had voted his dismission the next day after his ordination, which they might have done, and which they had a legal right to do. But had they done this, without any good reasons, they would have abused the confidence which Mr. Harding and his friends reposed in their honor, and inflicted an injury by disappointing their reasonable expectations. The case is precisely the same, if they vote his dismis-

sion at any future period, without any sufficient reasons. Now what reasons have been assigned for Mr. Harding's dismission? No other than "an honest difference of religious sentiments,"* between him and his people; that is, between him and the few, which, under the then very peculiar state of the society, constituted a majority of voters; and this difference was well known to exist at the time of his ordination. But it will be said that, by the terms of the contract, they had a legal right to dissolve it in this manner. This we do not deny. Nor is it of a violation of a legal contract that we complain. We mention the subject only to illustrate the nature of that *charity* by which those Unitarians, who were the authors and abetters of the transaction, were governed. One of the greatest and most frequent objections made by Unitarians against the conduct of the orthodox is, that they reject Unitarians of a fair moral character, on account of their sentiments. When a *Unitarian* minister has been dismissed, on account of his sentiments, "a loud and bitter cry" has been raised by Unitarians, respecting the uncharitableness, bigotry, and intolerance of Trinitarians:—a cry which has frequently been heard across the Atlantic, and echoed back again in the ears of all the American people. The minister thus ejected, has been represented as persecuted for his opinions; and those of his flock who have adhered to him, as suffering the deprivation of their rights and privileges. But we ask, is it persecution for the orthodox to dismiss a Unitarian minister for his sentiments, and is it charity for Unitarians to dismiss an orthodox minister for the same reason? Are those who desire the continuance of a Unitarian minister, when he is dismissed, deprived of their rights and privileges? and is the treatment which the adherents of an orthodox minister receive at his dismission, just what honor and justice dictate? But we have never heard of the orthodox dismissing an Unitarian minister for his sentiments merely, who continued of the same with which he was settled. But here is a minister, dismissed for his sentiments, while they are precisely the same which they were known to be at the time of his ordination; dismissed only for an honest difference of sentiment, by a people, who, while they assign this as the reason, give their full and decided testimony, that he had faithfully preached the gospel, as he believed it; dismissed, too, in opposition to the wishes of all his church, and a majority of those who attended his ministry. This minister is dismissed, that Unitarianism, instead of Orthodoxy, may be preached in his pulpit; while there is, within the distance of a little more than half a mile, a place of Unitarian worship, and not another in town where the doctrines of the Orthodox are preached; while, too, upwards of three hundred, manifest their earnest desire to hear orthodox preaching.

In addition to all this, when the minister is dismissed, and the aggrieved part of his flock left without a place of public wor-

* The following is a copy of a note sent to Mr. Harding, after they had voted his dismission:

Reverend Sir,—By vote of the second religious society, at their meeting last evening, Resolved, That the second religious society in Waltham, cheerfully and willingly declare, that they approve of the moral conduct of Rev. Sewal Harding, as the minister of said Society, and as their minister he has preached, with faithfulness and an earnest desire to be useful, the gospel, agreeably to his faith and creed; and that the only difference existing between the Society and him, is an honest difference of religious sentiments.

The above is an extract from the Records of the Society. THOMAS GORHAM, P. Clerk.

ship, and under the necessity of supporting a teacher by their own scanty funds, a very considerable proportion of them,—all who are connected with the manufacturing establishment in that place, are obliged to pay for seats in the meeting house which they have left, and in which they can no longer conscientiously worship; or leave the employment in which they are engaged, and by which they obtain their living. We have been repeatedly informed, that all those belonging to the manufacturing establishment, who have left the place of their former worship, because they cannot conscientiously hear Mr. W. are obliged to pay the same as though they regularly attended his ministry. It is said also, that a number of these persons who belonged to a Singing Society, to which some peculiar privileges were granted, have, because they have attended Mr. Harding's meeting, been excluded from this Society, and deprived of all its privileges. These things we could not have believed, had we not received the intelligence from the most unquestionable sources. We would ask, do the Honorable Boston Manufacturing Company *know* these things? We cannot believe that they intend to sanction such gross illiberality and oppression. But to return a moment to the charity of our Author. It was to those who had been active in measures such as have been described, and many others who must be supposed to have acquiesced in them, that he preached the sermon now before us, and in which are now to be found nearly four pages upon the subject of Unitarian charity and Trinitarian illiberality. It is here that the preacher says with so much self-complacency, and good nature, "We deny no man the christian name, privileges and hopes," merely because he is a Trinitarian. It is here, that he thinks it necessary to declare in behalf of himself and brethren, "Our preaching is also in the spirit of charity. We are not pursuing a party object. We are not acting on party principles. We are not actuated by a party spirit. We have not assumed a party name."

But how much better we ask is this Unitarian charity, than Orthodox uncharitableness? Who was ever benefited by being allowed the name of a christian, if with it must be associated that of a "persecutor," "idolater," "bigot," "enthusiast," "domineering ecclesiastic," or an usurper of the Lord's prerogative? Who would thank a person for admitting that he is a christian, when he at the same time asserts, that if he had the power he would burn his fellow-creatures at the stake, or exclude them from heaven? What consolation can it be to a Trinitarian to *know* that Unitarians believe him to be a christian, when at the same time he knows, that so far as he acts agreeably to his principles, he is less an object of their approbation and delight, than an infidel or a freethinker? Will a person that is deprived of his rights, and suffering in his person, by Unitarian influence, feel that ample compensation is made for his wrongs by the exalted privilege of being considered by his oppressors as a very devout and humble christian? No, this is adding insult to injury. To call an individual a christian, while you charge him with the crimes of idolatry, murder, and a wish to exclude his fellow-creatures from heaven, is to degrade the sacred name, and to reproach the great Head of the church for the approbation and delight which he has manifested in the character which it designates.

[To be continued.]

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. NOVEMBER, 1826. No. 11.

THE APOSTLES' DIRECTION TO THE AWAKENED JAILER.

A SERMON.

ACTS, XVI. 29—32. *Then he called for a light, and sprang in and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas: and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.*

PAUL and Silas, having miraculously cured a damsel possessed of a spirit of divination, excited the resentment of her masters, who drew them into the market-place unto the rulers; and the multitude rose up together against them; and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them. And when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely. But while they were in prison and their feet made fast in the stocks, at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awaking out of sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, drew his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here. Then he called for a light, and sprang in and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas: and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. These words naturally lead us to consider,

I. The state of this awakened sinner.

II. The import of his question to the apostles.

III. The manner in which they treated him in answer to his question.

IV. Show that they treated him right.

I. We are to consider the state of the awakened jailer. He was

undoubtedly a stupid, hardened, stout-hearted sinner; but his fears were effectually alarmed by a realizing sense of death and eternity. Earthquakes are the most awful dispensations of Providence in this world. They have been more destructive than wars, famines, and conflagrations. They sunk towns and cities, with the many thousands of their inhabitants in sudden and remediless ruin. The earthquake which shook the foundations of the prison and the earth around it, was extremely alarming to the jailer, and threatened him with instant death. But though the first shock was short, yet he knew not but it might be soon repeated and become fatal. After this cause of fear abated, there was another, which renewed and increased his fearful apprehensions. He saw the prison doors open, and thought that all the prisoners had escaped, for which he expected his own life would be taken. Death and eternity stared him in face, for which he felt himself entirely unprepared. He was in deep anxiety and distress, which constrained him to cry to the Apostles, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" This leads us to consider,

II. The import of his question. His fears of temporal death excited the fears of eternal death. He had done nothing but disobey God all his days, and abuse his goodness and patience. His conscience condemned him for all the exercises of his heart and all the actions of his life. He had a realizing view of the invisible world, and saw nothing before him but a miserable eternity. He knew not what to do, to escape the wrath to come. He was an awakened, self-condemned, distressed sinner, and anxiously concerned about the salvation of his soul. We must suppose, therefore, that by asking the Apostles what he must do to be saved, he meant to ask them, to direct him how he might escape eternal death and obtain eternal life. He put the solemn question not to the other prisoners but to the Apostles, because he had heard them called "the servants of the high God, who shew unto men the way of salvation;" or because he knew their characters as ministers of the gospel. He knew by some means or other, that they were the proper men to direct him what to do, in his guilty, distressed, and perishing condition. His sins revived and his hopes died. He saw no way in which a holy and just God could save him from deserved destruction. He most respectfully said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved;" and he most sincerely desired, that the Apostles would instruct and direct him to do something, that might be the means of securing his future and eternal happiness. They understood his question in this sense, and most cheerfully complied with his importunate request. Let us next consider,

III. How they instructed and directed this awakened and inquiring sinner. On this point the text gives us plain information. As soon as he brought the Apostles out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? They said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord." In the first place, they preached the gospel to him, which is called the word of the Lord. They exhibited the character of Christ, who came into the world to seek and save them that were lost; who was God and man in two distinct na-

tures, who suffered and died on the cross, and made a full atonement for the sins of the world, that God might be *just*, and the justifier of every one that believeth in Jesus. They briefly explained saving faith, or taught him wherein it consisted. They informed him, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that is the *word of faith which we preach;* that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus Christ, and shalt believe *in thy heart* that God hath raised him from the dead, *thou shalt be saved.* For with the heart man beliveth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Such a concise and clear description of Christ and the way of salvation by him, we may suppose the Apostles gave to the awakened and distressed sinner in a very short time; and then directed him to do, what was his immediate and imperious duty to do, that is, to believe on the Lord Jesus. They first explained his duty, and then exhorted him to perform it immediately, or without the least delay. It now remains to show,

IV. That they directed him right. This will appear, if we consider the following observations.

1. They directed him in the same manner, in which the inspired Prophets directed sinners to do their duty. God often sent his Prophets to reprove impenitent sinners for their sins, to warn them of their danger, and to exhort them in his name, to reform, repent, and do their duty. And we find many instances of their faithfully discharging this solemn office. Isaiah exhorted sinners to seek the Lord and return to him immediately. "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Jeremiah exhorted sinners in this form: "Thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and Jerusalem, break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of your hearts, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it." Ezekiel addressed sinners in these words, "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Joel exhorts sinners in the same strain: "Therefore also *now*, saith the Lord, turn ye even *to me*, with all your heart—and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful." All the inspired prophets, agreeably to the divine direction, exhorted sinners to change their hearts, to repent, and return to God, without the least delay. And if they exhorted sinners right, the Apostles exhorted the jailer right; for they exhorted him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ immediately, and to do his duty as soon as he knew it.

2. They taught this awakened and inquiring sinner right, because they taught and directed him as Christ taught and directed sinners. He was a teacher who came from God, and declared,

how to love God, how to repent of sin, or how to believe in Christ, after he knew he was the only and all-sufficient Saviour. He did not ask, and they did not tell him *how* to do his duty, after he knew it. They taught and directed him exactly according to his character and situation, and according to their duty as ministers of the gospel. Christ had taught and directed them how to teach and direct inquiring sinners, and they taught and directed him, as Christ had taught and directed them, to do their duty as his ministers. They therefore taught and directed the jailer right. They exhorted him to do his duty immediately, which was to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, without delay. If any thing further needs to be said to confirm this important point, I would further observe,

5. They taught and directed him right, because they taught and directed him agreeably to reason and common sense. He asked what he should do to be saved. He wanted to know his duty in his present trying situation. He thought he *ought* to do something, and he wanted to know what he ought to do, for his conscience was awake, and he felt his obligation to do right, or what his real duty required him to do. He did not ask to know what he must do *before* he could do any duty, but what he could then do as duty. The Apostles having instructed him, in respect to his character and condition as a totally depraved, guilty, condemned sinner, and in respect to Christ as the only and all-sufficient Saviour, exhorted him to judge and condemn himself, repent unfeignedly of his sins, renounce all self-dependance, and rely alone on the atonement of Christ for pardon and salvation. This was his immediate duty, and the Apostles exhorted him to do it immediately; and this was certainly agreeable to his reason and common sense, and to the reason and common sense of all mankind. Thus the parent instructs and directs his child, the teacher his scholar, and the officer the soldier, in regard to duty. They only tell those under their care and direction what to do, and then require them to do it. After the child, the scholar, and the soldier are told what they must do, they need no further instruction and direction in respect to their duty. Just so, after the Apostles had told the jailer what he must do to be saved, he needed no further instruction or direction, in respect to his duty. He was morally bound to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ immediately. They had no right to tell him, he might wait till *morning* before he believed, or that he might merely desire, endeavour, or try to believe, before he actually exercised saving faith. When he knew his duty, he was instantly bound to do it, and had no right to ask what he must do before he was willing to do his duty, or how he must become willing. After a parent has told his child what he must do, and his child should say, I am unwilling to do it; pray, Sir, how shall I become willing; or if a scholar should say the same to his teacher; or a soldier say the same to his commanding officer; would the parent, the teacher, or the officer, give any new direction? No; they would all repeat and enforce their first command. What if the jailer had said, after the Apostles had instructed and directed him to believe on the

Lord Jesus Christ, Sirs, I am unwilling to believe, and how shall I become willing? Would they have given him any new instruction or direction? No; they had no right to say any thing more than what Christ had told them to say, "he that believeth not shall be damned." It now clearly appears, we trust, that the Apostles instructed and directed the jailer right, in respect to his duty The example of the prophets, the example of Christ, the command of Christ, the case of the jailer, and common sense, all required them to do as they did.

[To be continued.]

For the Christian Magazine.

REMARKS ON THE USUAL METHOD OF INTERPRETING THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF PROPHECY, PARABLE AND ALLEGORY.

THE Bible is the word of God; and because it is the word of God, it certainly differs, in some important respects, from the imperfect productions of men. But there are not a few who seem to suppose, that, because the Bible is the word of God, it scarcely resembles other books in *any* respect. If we understand the word book, in its usual sense, as denoting the conceptions of the human mind, expressed in language, reduced to writing according to the common idioms of speech; the Bible, in their apprehension can hardly be included within the definition. Accordingly in interpreting the scriptures, they dismiss from their minds, in a great measure, many of the principles, which always guide them in explaining the language of a merely human author. But it ought to be remembered, that, while the *inspiration* of the sacred writers, influenced the style and language which they exhibit, these are at the same time the proper style and language of *themselves*, as really as those of any other writers are. Hence the propriety, nay the *necessity* of interpreting the scriptures in a manner like that in which we interpret other writings, must certainly be felt. For how did the Holy Spirit influence the sacred writers? Certainly *as rational* and *voluntary* agents. "The spirits of the prophets," says Paul, "are subject to the Prophets." The appearance of the sacred volume declares that they were assisted by the Spirit of God in writing it *after the manner of men.* This, moreover, the *nature of their work* required. For why did God employ *human* instruments *at all* —if not in order to adapt his word to the understandings and sympathies of men? We believe, now, that the Spirit of God is the efficient cause of regeneration; yet, at the same time, who does not know that the subjects of the new birth are themselves *voluntary agents* in all that they feel and perform in the progress of this change, and that their behaviour is to be explained by a reference to the principles of the human mind, in view of religious truth. Something like this seems to be true of inspiration. Yet this circumstance seems to be in a great measure overlooked by many, when interpreting the scriptures. Nay, perhaps it may be said, *in a certain sense*, that a person might be too much influenced, in the interpretation of the scriptures, by the consideration of their having been inspired,—I mean that he might be inclined to view all their features too much in the light of *peculiarities.*

We are most liable to commit this error in respect to those portions of the sacred writings, which were composed in the manner of poetry, and of parable or allegory; in as much as the character of this kind of composition is least likely to comport with what we imagine, *a priori*, ought to be the attributes of an inspired volume. —Nothing can be clearer than that the Prophets have generally composed their sacred oracles in poetry; yet no kind of writing can be more exposed to be misapprehended by the class of interpreters, to which I have just alluded, than that, in which a poetic diction is employed in order to communicate prophetic sentiments. The imagery of a figurative style is adapted to call forth conjecture from an interpreter; while, at the same time, he is prone to indulge in this with the greater liberty, since the facts which prophecy discloses are, for the most part, not very definitely and particularly described.

The most common errors of good men in explaining the prophecies arise from their having neglected to observe how extensively the Hebrew poets make use of tropical language. Some idea of the manner of the Prophets, in this particular, may be acquired from a comparison of those predictions, which *have had* their full accomplishment, with the actual history of the events predicted.

The protection and providence of God exhibited to the Jews, in respect to their return to Palestine, through the Arabian desert, after the Babylonish captivity, is predicted by the Prophet Isaiah in the following manner, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain." "I will open rivers in high places and fountains in the midst of the valleys; I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water: I will plant in the wilderness the cedar and the myrtle, and the oil tree; and I will set in the desert the fir tree and the pine and the box tree together."

Let any one now consult the account of the Jews' return from Babylon, as given by Ezra and Nehemiah, and then say how much of this beautiful prophetic representation, is found to correspond *literally* with historical *fact*. The march of the Israelites thro' this waste, was commenced by the permission of Cyrus, and sustained by his munificence. Every indigent Jew was furnished by him [to use the words of his own edict,] "with silver and with gold and with goods and with beasts; besides a free-will offering for the house of the Lord at Jerusalem,"—and in a very short time the Hebrews were settled in their respective cities. It is evident that the language of the prophet Isaiah in this instance is *figurative* in the highest degree; and that there is only a very *general* correspondence between the literal sense of the prophecy and the events which it foretold. The sinking hills and rising vallies, the fruit trees planted and streams gushing forth in the desert, are all interpreted by the *event*, as denoting merely the means of a safe and prosperous return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity. Other examples in abundance of the same kind exist, which might easily be selected

for our purpose, did they not require a developement which would exceed the limits of this occasion.

Some of the prophecies will undoubtedly admit of a more literal interpretation than the one which we have noticed; but in all cases we are to *avoid* a literal interpretation of them, in proportion as their phraseology departs from that of the mere *historic* and *didactic* style of the scriptures; which is as peculiar for its plainness and simplicity, as the sacred poetry, for the beauty and boldness of its ornament.

The *fulfilment* of the predictions uttered by the prophets, has explained and limited their meaning; but if the time of their accomplishment was yet to come, some of them no doubt, would receive a very different interpretation from that which we must now give them. Much, it would seem then, is to be learned from such examples, respecting the interpretation of the prophetic writings in general, and the great extent to which the prophets make use of tropical and symbolical representation.—Much which should lead us to explain in a more cautious manner than is commonly done, the prophecies which are yet unaccomplished; or which should, at least, incline us to pronounce less positively concerning the *particular* and *definite* character of predicted events, that are yet future.

The errors which are often committed in the interpretation of the parables and the allegorical parts of scripture, are of a nature somewhat different from those to which we have just alluded. *They* often arise from mistaking the figurative for the literal sense of language. In parables, however, the *language should be* understood in a literal sense.

It is not the *phraseology* here, but the whole subject matter of the representation itself which the writer has employed in a figurative or symbolical manner.

Parable is used by the sacred writers, and more frequently by our Saviour, for the purpose of ILLUSTRATING some principle of morality and religion. It is a *supposed case*, affording some popular exemplification of such principle.—Accordingly Luke introduces the mention of one of Christ's parables thus—"And he spake a parable unto them *to this end*, that men ought always to pray and not to faint,"—that is, to illustrate the efficacy of persevering, importunate prayer,—and then follows the parable of the widow and the unjust judge. —Now the error of which we complain in regard to the explanation of parables is that of giving too important signification to their subordinate parts; or of endeavouring to find branches and relations of meaning, which correspond with all the appendages, which the writer has thrown into his parable, merely for the sake of giving to the whole an appearance of verisimilitude. The error lies in supposing a too minute correspondence between the parable and the subject which it is designed to illustrate.—In the parable of the barren fig-tree, for example, a late respectable commentator makes the owner of the vineyard to be God, the vineyard, Judea—the fig-tree, the Jewish church—and the vine-dresser, Christ: whereas the context shows that the Saviour aimed at nothing more in the parable, than the communication of this simple idea, that negative virtue, merely, without ac-

tive usefulness, will not render a man's life harmless in the sight of God, nor save him from final condemnation. Had the commentator referred to, met with this parable in any merely human production, he would never have invented a signification for it, beyond the extent of this obvious moral, which it is designed to inculcate.

Dr. Johnson thus introduces the history of Rasselas. "Ye who listen with credulity to the whispers of fancy, and pursue with eagerness the phantoms of hope; who expect that age will perform the promises of youth, and that the deficiencies of the present day, will be supplied by the morrow; listen to the history of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia." What reader now of common understanding, ever looks for any thing more in the subsequent pages of Rasselas, than simply for *such a story* as shall aptly illustrate the folly of listening to the whispers of fancy with *credulity*, and of pursuing the phantoms of hope with eagerness; or the mistake of those who expect that age will perform the promises of youth, and to-morrow supply the deficiencies of to-day? Scarcely any one is so simple as not to know that the characters, the incidents, and the scenery, with which the author has filled up this instructive fiction, are all chosen, arranged and described for the single purpose of illustrating the moral so comprehensively implied in the first period; and that many parts of the story, if considered separately from their relation to the whole, would possess no particular moral significancy whatever.

In a similar manner ought we to interpret the parables of the sacred volume, if we would not, like some of those to whom they were first addressed, fall under the condemnation of hearing, but not understanding them. If for example we peruse the parable of the good Samaritan, let us be contented to learn from it, what the Saviour designed to teach—the characteristics of a truly benevolent friend and neighbour,—rather than overlooking this invaluable lesson, to find in it as some have done, Adam passing through this world, in the man passing from Jerusalem to Jericho—the devil and his angels in the robbers—the Mosaic Law, in the Priest—in the Levite, good works—in the good Samaritan, Christ—in the *inn*, the church—and in the oil and wine, grace and spiritual consolation. Nor should we feel while thus interpreting the Bible, without admitting the mystical and manifold significations of words, without finding mountains of sense in every expression and letter of it; that we are in danger of diminishing *aught in reality*, from the treasures of the sacred volume. The early education of some, most strongly inclines them to attach some unnatural peculiarity of this kind, to all the language of the word of God; and it is only after such a bias has been entirely removed from their minds, that they are prepared to see divine truth in its own admirable simplicity. He who has studied the Bible under the influence of views the most enlightened and spiritual, will undoubtedly be the most ready to declare, that, while the *separate hints* which he once could gather from the sacred writings, have been diminished in *number;* while some texts on which he once relied as proof texts, are taken from him, yet new ones are discovered which

before were unknown to him, and the force of others, which he has found to abide the test of a most thorough examination, is a thousand fold augmented. R.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAP. XII.

Now, in the morning, I perceived that the pilgrims arose strong and vigorous to pursue their journey; and having taken leave of the family, and having received from them a letter of introduction to such other houses as had been built by their Lord for the accommodation of pilgrims on the road, they departed and went on their way. And as they went along, they discoursed with each other of the things they had seen and heard at the house Beautiful, and of the high privileges they had enjoyed there; and they were so taken up with these things that they forgot to read any in their books, as they had been went to do while they passed along.

I think, said Ardent, that we shall be willing to bear cheerfully any reproach or persecution to which we may be subjected, for the sake of the Lord of the way, since he has endured so much for us.

Thoughtful. It would, indeed, be unworthy of the name we bear, and of the privileges to which we have been admitted, if we should shrink from any sufferings to which our Lord shall call us.

Ard. I have been rash and hasty, heretofore, and have brought myself into many difficulties by it, but I hope that the experience I have had will teach me better in future.

Th. I hope the things we have learned will do us good as long as we live; and that the high privileges we have lately enjoyed will lead us to seek after yet greater attainments, and to be bold and zealous in the service of our Lord and Master.

Then I perceived, that, just as they were saying these things, a man came up behind them, whose name was *Flatterwell;* but the pilgrims knew him not. And having overheard some of their conversation, he said,

Fl. Hail! ye highly favored ones, ye servants of the prince Immanuel, who have undertaken this long and perilous journey for the love you bear to his name. Your prince regards you with great affection, and is willing to give you a further proof of it. You have, indeed, enjoyed high privileges at the house Beautiful, but there are higher privileges to be yet enjoyed. You have seen great things there; but you shall see greater things than these.

Ard. We have never seen you before; but you speak like one that has some knowledge of us, and of the object of our journey. We should like to know who you are.

Fl. Ask not after my name, seeing it is a secret. I am a friend to you, and to the Lord of the way; and am not ignorant of your history. I know how you forsook all that you had, for the love you bare to the Lord of pilgrims. And I know all the pains you have taken to show that love to him, and all the difficulties you have surmounted for his sake. I have done so before you, and have been rewarded for it by being appointed to an honorable

station. I am sent forth to accompany you a little in your way, and to speak words of comfort to you; and also to give you some further manifestations of the regard which your Lord has to you.

Th. No praise is due to us for what we have done. It is the King alone that has made us to differ. Had it not been for his distinguishing grace, we had remained to this day in the city of Destruction.

Fl. I know it; and I am glad to see you so sensible of it. Humility is a most excellent trait in the pilgrim's character. But I knew you possessed it in an eminent degree; for otherwise I should not have been sent out to accompany you, and to confer further privileges upon you. It is written, "before honour is humility;" and "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." I am persuaded that the Lord of the way intends to make you eminent among pilgrims, and to prepare you for great usefulness among them; and therefore it is, that having tried you hitherto, and found you so faithful to him, he is ready to grant you further marks of his regard.

Ard. I have not been so faithful to him as I ought; nor so firm in his ways as my brother Thoughtful. But I hope I shall be more so hereafter.

Fl. No; none are so faithful to him as they ought to be. But you have been more so than many others.—Your low opinion of yourself, however, is a good sign; and it promises well with regard to your future progress.

Th. Your commendation makes me ashamed of myself; for it brings to mind my numerous imperfections and short comings in duty.

Fl. That is well. It shows that you are not easily flattered; and so are in less danger of being deceived and led astray, than those who have less knowledge of their own hearts.

By this time I perceived that Flatterwell had got a little before them, and as they were engaged in conversation, had turned out of the straight road into another path, which yet seemed almost as direct as the right one, and was leading them on in it with a quicker step, while the path by degrees turned more from the direct road, up an ascent that was so gradual that the pilgrims did not perceive it. Then said Ardent,

What are the new privileges which the Lord of the way is about to bestow upon us?

Fl. They are privileges granted to but few pilgrims, to such only as he regards with peculiar affection, and intends for distinguished usefulness. Yonder is a high tower, from which is a most delightful prospect. You can look down from it on all the country round for many leagues; and with the aid of a perspective glass, you can see the celestial city, and all the road thither, together with all the by-paths that turn out of it; so that after having had this discovery, you will be eminently qualified to be guides to other pilgrims, for which I am persuaded the Lord of the way intends you.

Th. We are not worthy of being distinguished above others; but if the Lord of the way has need of us, in any station, we ought not to decline it.

Fl. I admire your humility. But indeed, it is a most excellent qualification for a place of high distinction.

So Flatterwell hurried them along, till they reached the tower,

and began to ascend by a flight of steps that wound round in the inside; and I observed that there were no windows in it, only a small sky-light at the top. So they ascended, for some time, Flatterwell keeping before, and continually talking to them, in the manner he had done, of the great regard their Lord had for them, and of the high honor to which he was now admitting them, in favoring them to visit this tower, and enjoy the discoveries which were to be made when they arrived at the top. Now when they had reached a great height, I saw that Flatterwell, in his eagerness to hurry them along, not taking heed to his own steps, made a slip with his feet, and fell to the bottom, where he was dashed in pieces. At this the pilgrims stopped, in great amazement and sat down on the steps, to prevent falling themselves, for their heads grew dizzy.

Then said Thoughtful to his companion what does this mean?

Then said Ardent, I cannot tell; I fear I shall fall too; for my head is very dizzy.

Th. And so is mine. I fear to look down. What shall we do?

Ard. I know not. This is a fearful place. Shall we try to go down?

Th. Ah me! I have forgotten to look in my book to-day. But I know not whether I can see to read. There is so little light here: and my head is so much affected.

Ard. I have forgotten too. But let us try to read a little. Perhaps we shall get some direction.

So Thoughtful plucked his book out of his bosom, and opened it, and read therein as follows: "Pride goeth before destruction; and a haughty spirit before a fall." Then his hand shook, and his head was affected again, so that he could not see for some time. And Ardent looked into the book, and found where it was written. "The Lord shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things." Then Thoughtful looked again, and read, "Meddle not with him that flattereth with his lips. A lying tongue hateth those that are afflicted by it; and a flattering mouth worketh ruin."

Then I perceived that the pilgrims were sore amazed, and trembled for fear. For they began to be sensible that they must have got out of the right road, and had been flattered by the man they had followed, who had now met with the destruction he was probably intending for them. So they crept down the steps, as well as they could, which they now perceived to be very slight, and threatening every moment to give way, and precipitate them upon the pavement below, where Flatterwell had been dashed in pieces.

So, after a long time, I saw that they had reached the bottom in safety, and having earnestly besought their Lord and King to forgive them for hearkening to this deceiver, and turning out of the right path; and having begged for direction and deliverance, and further consulted their books, they found written therein, "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings."

Then after they were a little revived, (for their heads were still much affected,) they considered the tower and its situation; and found written over the door by which they had entered, "*The Tower of Spiritual Pride.*" They saw, moreover, that it stood upon the brink of a precipice, on looking down which they saw the

bones of many who had been led up to the top of the tower, and thrown down from thence, by Flatterwell and his companions. Then they remembered that it was written, "Behold, I am against thee, Oh thou most proud, saith the Lord God of Hosts: for thy day is come, the time that I will visit thee. And the most proud shall stumble and fall, and none shall raise him up."

Now I observed, that though their heads were less giddy, since they had reached the ground, they complained to each other of a violent pain in the breast; attended with distressing faintness, so that they could scarcely stand upon their feet. Yet, after reading a while in their books, they recovered a little, so that they began to return by the way that they came, creeping on softly, as well as they could, till, at length they reached the high road. Here they kneeled down, and gave thanks to the Lord of the way, for their deliverance from this so great a danger, and for restoring them to the right way; and then they went forward, carefully pondering the path of their feet. So, taking heed to their steps, they went down into the valley of Humiliation, without getting any slip by the way. Now the air of this valley was very agreeable and refreshing to them, and they had not been long in it before they found themselves much recovered from the sickness they had felt. The dizziness in their heads was gone, the pain in their breasts was greatly relieved, and they had no more turns of faintness. BUNYANUS.

ETERNITY is much less considered by us than we generally suppose. We are apt, alas! to be religious for *Time*.

EFFECTS OF THE BIBLE.——*An Anecdote.*

I was travelling about four years ago in a remote district in Bengal, and I came to the house of a gentleman belonging to Portugal. I found him reading the Scriptures in the Bengalee to seventy or eighty people, men, women and children, of that country, who were all very attentive. This gentleman told me that he had been led to employ some of his leisure moments in this way; "And to-morrow," said he, "as you pass my farm, mention my name, and they will procure you a bed; and you will then see the effects of reading the Scripture." The next day I called at his estate, where I saw one hundred men, women, and children, who had all become converts to Christianity within three or four years. I inquired how they found themselves: they appeared delighted, and thought it a happy thing for them that Europeans had translated the Scripture, that they might read in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. I had some intercourse, also, with an official person in that district, and I mention it because some persons tell you that nothing is done by the Missionaries; I asked the Magistrate what was the conduct of these Christians; and he said, "There is something in them that does excite astonishment: the inhabitants of this district are particularly known as being so litigious and troublesome that they have scarcely any matter but what they bring into courts of justice; but during three or four years, not one of these people has brought a cause against *any one*, or any one against them." I mention this to show that Christianity will produce, in all countries, peace and

happiness to those who know the truth as it is in Jesus.—*Lieut. Col. Phipps.*

THE PROGRESS OF ERROR.

THE doctrine of the eternal Sonship of the Divine nature of Christ produced Arianism; the doctrine of Arianism produced Socinianism; and Socinianism produces a kind of general Infidelity, or disrespect to the sacred writings; so that several parts of them are rejected as being uncanonical, and the inspiration of a major part of the New Testament strongly suspected.

Clark.

HINT TO PARISHIONERS.

No one can know the trials of the ministry, except those who undertake the arduous employment, or those who reside in their families. When we consider how much clergymen's time is occupied by unavoidable company at home, how many special meetings, if they are faithful to their master, they must attend, what a large portion of their time is occupied in visiting the sick, how much in necessary preparations for the pulpit, and then in addition to all this, what numbers of parochial visits they are required to make, and censured if they do not, it must appear obvious that their task is arduous, their trials peculiarly great. It is a great trial to be obliged to attempt to study, when the mind is distracted with the burden of a whole Society. It is a trial to be, as it were, compelled to spend that time in visiting, which ought to be devoted to writng and meditation, and then be censured for negligent and ill-digested sermons; or, if time and pains are taken to write good sermons, to be complained of for visiting so little. Surely, if Societies or Churches knew the trials of their ministers, in addition to those personal troubles which are common to all, they would be more tender of them, more fervent in prayer for them. I do not wonder that so many of the laborers of the Lord's vineyard faint before mid-day. They ought in every way to be strengthened, and comforted, and encouraged, by their people.—*Mrs. Huntington's Memoirs.*

CONSCIENCE.

SHALL we chide, or weep to see the wickedness of these times and the distance betwixt Paul and us? O Paul, thou art almost alone. Thou studiest conscience; we of this age, craft. Thou didst gague thine own; we, other men's consciences. Thy care was to please conscience; ours, to please the times. It was thy care to walk evenly before God and men; it is ours, to serve ourselves of both. Thou, everywhere, was for conscience; we, almost no where. Thou wouldst see conscience take no wrong; now, wit out-reasons it, wealth out-faces it, money outbuys it, might overmatches it, all undervalue it. It is a wonderful thing that so rich a pearl, should be so cheap; so rare a thing, so commonly sold. Surely markets are dead for conscience. Every man is more ready to sell than to buy, and to put off upon any rate. For sixpence, a man will lie; for sixpence, he will steal; for sixpence, he will swear: yea, in some causes, and in some halls of justice, you may have twelve

consciences for one dinner. O Conscience, keep not silence at this. Know thy place. Do thy office. Cry, now thou art among scholars, tradesmen, jurors, lawyers, landlords, merchants, judges. Cry against those houses that discommon thee, against those shops that sell thee, those pleaders that purse thee, those jurors that stretch and rack thee, those judges that disgrace and hang thee. *R. Harris.*

ORIGIN OF TEXTS.

THE custom of taking a text as the basis of a sermon or lecture, is said to have originated with Ezra, who, we are told, accompanied by several Levites in a public congregation of men and women, ascended a pulpit, opened a book of the law, and after addressing a prayer to the Deity, to which the people said Amen, "read in the law of God distinctly and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.*

Previous to the time of Ezra, the patriachs delivered in public assemblies, either propecies or moral instructions for the edification of the people; and it was not until the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, during which time they had almost lost the language in which the pentateuch was written, that it became necessary to explain, as well as to read, the scriptures to them; a practice adopted by Ezra, and since universally followed. In later times, as we are told in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. xiv. 21, the books of Moses were thus read in the synagogue every Sabbath day. To this laudable custom our Saviour conformed; and in the synagogue at Nazareth, read a passage from the prophet Isaiah, then closing the book, returned it to the priest, and preached from the text. This custom which now prevails all over the Christian world, was interrupted in the dark ages, when the Ethics of Aristotle were read in many churches on Sunday instead of the Holy Scriptures.—*Collett's Relics of Literature.*

* Nehemiah, chap. viii. 3.

A GOOD EXPEDIENT FOR THE PRESERVATION OF WEALTH.

"Riches take to themselves wings and fly away."

AN old divine, commenting on this passage, observes, "Clip their wings by seasonable liberality, and you will keep them at home."

DRESS THE MIND.

ON the Sunday morning before going to church, what a dressing there is among all classes, and what a stir to appear gay and pleasing! Is it quite sufficient for the great purposes of our existence to wash the outside of the platter? Curls may be arranged, fine tortoise shell combs fixed, sparkling ear-rings hung, splendid garments displayed, and yet perhaps the gay fair one's mind may be poisoned with conceit, troubled with rivalry, and kept on the torture by ignorance and vanity. Windsor soap does not wash out the stains of the heart; Cologne water cannot throw a fragrance over an impure mind; nor will all the rubies of Golconda dazzle the recording angel into forgetfulness of filling up the leaves of the book of retribution.

Nat. Advocate.

THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF A SABBATH-BREAKER.

To the Editors of the Christian Magazine.

Gentlemen,—I send you a few thoughts occasioned by the death of a Sabbath-breaker, which you are at liberty to insert in the Magazine, if you think proper.

Nothing can be more clear than that to reject the Bible, and neglect the institutions of the gospel, is unsafe and dangerous; nor are those who do this those only who openly deny revelation: for, in fact, all those are of this character, who do not conform their lives to the precepts, and their minds and hearts to the doctrines and sentiments, of the word of God.

The Bible was given, that learning our evil condition and becoming sensible, through the blessing of the Holy Spirit, of our aberration from rectitude, we might be recovered to the side of virtue and salvation. Because, whether we will or not, we must be associated either with the good, or with the bad; with God and holy angels and the spirits of just men made perfect, or with the devil and his angels, and all reprobate spirits: and whoever casts away the law of the Lord and despises the word of the Holy One of Israel—must be associated with the latter.

The way of transgressors is hard. So Heaven has decreed, and so it must be. There is moreover a reason for it in the nature of things. God is unalterable not merely from choice, but in his very nature—So he has taught us: 'I am the Lord, I change not.' Every thing is in conformity with this fact in his character. Existing ever the same, there was an infinite beauty and loveliness to the mind of God in virtue and an infinite deformity in sin. In this view of things, it was, He laid the foundations of his government: in this view, He created his rational offspring: in this view, He gave them laws: in this view, He puts a difference between the precious and the vile: and in this view, He will forever treat the sinner differently from what he will the righteous. No circumstances, no change of state or outward condition, can alter the case. Whether sinners of this or of that character, if still impenitent, God must from the nature of things, and from the perfection of his character, deliver us over unceasingly to evil and to misery; because that never can be virtue which is now vice.

Depart from the word of God, and no one knows to what he may be left. He takes part at once with the enemies of righteousness, and lays himself open to all iniquity—He plants himself openly against order and rectitude—Principles sure as those which regulate the sun in his course, operate continually to his final overthrow—He may hope for success and flatter himself in his deception for the present, but the moment hastens when confusion and dread dismay shall overwhelm him, forever and ever. No man hardeneth himself against God to prosper. The eternal principles of order shall plague him, and the steady movement of the Almighty in display of infinite benevolence shall set him abashed at last, a monument of desolation. Men sport with the Bible now. It is their jest-book and the butt of ribaldry with some. They pour contempt upon its doctrines and make the humble worshipper their song.

But where is the man to do this? Cut off in an evil hour he is gone—or though such remain and

abound in the community, they shall go as awfully, perhaps, as any who have gone before them. There is no withstanding God, nor the vengeance of his powerful displeasure. He may long bear and forbear, but by and by that blow shall come, fatal and eternally decisive—and it may be a hastened blow.

True, we are not rashly to conclude on the final state of men from the judgments of God upon them; but neither are we to forget that he, that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy. It is the appointment of heaven too that 'the wicked shall not live out half their days:' while 'the righteous hath hope in his death the wicked are driven away in their wickedness.'

Always avoiding rash and particular references, it cannot be too firmly impressed upon our mind, that even in this life, and especially in the manner of its close, God is wont, not unfrequently, to visit notorious offenders with special marks of his displeasure.

The events of life may connect much more closely with character and conduct, than we are aware of or can decide upon. God sees behind the curtain which hides the spiritual world from us, and weighs our actions in an even balance; and though He does not retribute fully in the present world, he may yet do it in sufficient measure to evince his general love of holiness and hatred of sin. Though not invariable and sure, there is a constituted connexion between piety and happiness, impiety and misery—To live long and see good days, the word of God instructs us to keep our tongue from evil and our lips that they speak no guile: while on the contrary, it threatens us that if we refuse instruction, and after repeated warnings, still remain impenitent, we shall be cut off with marked displeasure—and something according to the life, may be the final close. It is the way with sinners to wax worse and worse. Judgments often thicken in proportion to their guilt, and the final issue is awful and affecting. Behold it in the profligate: behold it in the profane: behold it in the man of intemperance and licentiousness. They often bear the marks of God's displeasure thicker and thicker in poverty, disease and disgrace; in horrors of conscience and despair, or in a turpidity which to a reflecting, serious mind, is scarcely less painful and distressing. Bold offenders are ever liable to sudden and awful death. If these men die the common death of all men, that is, if they die a natural death, *then*, said Moses, 'the Lord *hath not* sent me.' Accordingly they did not die a natural death. The earth opened and swallowed them up. Nor though the day of miracles is past, have sacred things ceased to be profaned. Strange fire has been offered by others besides Dathan and Abiram; and sin is still as offensive in the sight of God as it was in the day of Moses. The way of transgressors is a hard way and ever liable to an appalling issue.

Reader, beware of sin—By degress it becomes the element of him who indulges it—Reason and judgment, fear and shame, the hope of heaven and the dread of hell, are all as nothing to prevent indulgence when we once become enslaved. Consider what amazing power sin has in the soul, and arm yourself against it by the word of God and by prayer

For surely there is a God in heaven who marks the enormity of sin and will punish the transgressor with his rebukes. *

For the Christian Magazine.

I know not, said one, that I neglect to do any thing in my power to promote the interests of true religion in this place; and I seem to be held in very little repute, scarcely any person even noticing me. To which it was replied, my good Friend, set yourself down for *nothing*, and if any person takes you for *something*, it will be all clear gain.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

OBJECTIONS TO UNCONDITIONAL SUBMISSION, CONSIDERED; IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

Dear Friend,—I have read Mr. S.'s arguments against unconditional submission, which appear to me more plausible than conclusive. Submission is as well understood, I believe, as resignation; and either term properly signifies a willingness to suffer any evil which God pleases to inflict. This willingness, however, does not imply any love to evil, but only love to God who inflicts it. Love to God is always implied in submission, which can flow from no other source. None but a regenerate person, or if you please, none but a christian ever exercises submission to God under any evil which God inflicts, whether small or great. Indeed, the same spirit of benevolence, which will dispose a person to submit to God, under the least evil, will dispose him to submit to God under the greatest; because God appears as amiable in inflicting the greatest, as in inflicting the least evil. The difficulty, if there be any in this question, lies not in determining the nature or degree of submission, but in determining *when* any regenerate person or real christian ought to be willing that God should destroy him in a future state. To set this point in as clear a light as I can, I would observe,

1. That a person may be regenerated, and yet not know that he is so. Though regeneration consists in *new* affections, and he may know, in the time of it, that he does exercise *new* affections, yet he may not know that his *new* affections are *holy* affections, and consequently not know that he is the subject of a saving change, and a real child of God. He may be in this dark and doubtful state, for days, or weeks, or even for months, after his heart is renewed. This many a christian has declared when he made a public profession of religion.

2. A renewed person or real christian, who does not know that he is renewed, cannot know that he is entitled to eternal life, according to the promises of the gospel. Though it be true that he *is* entitled to eternal life, yet he sees no evidence of it so long as he sees no evidence of being a subject of saving grace. Therefore,

3. A regenerate person or real christian, in such a situation, must view himself as exposed to future misery. As he does not view himself as a believer, he must view himself to be an unbeliever and actually deserving and exposed to the punishment of an unbeliever; or, in other words, he must suppose that God is as much disposed to punish him forever as any other sinner.

4. While a regenerate person or real christian, thus views him-

self under a sentence of condemnation, he certainly ought to be willing that God should execute that sentence of condemnation upon him. He certainly must be willing that God should do this, or else he is unwilling. But to be unwilling, is practically saying that God shall not reign over him, or dispose of him as shall be most for his own glory. Now I ask Mr. S. or any other person, how a real subject of grace ought to feel in such a situation as this? You will say he ought to *desire* salvation. I say so too. But ought he to desire salvation absolutely, or unconditionally, whether he be a subject of grace, or not? He does not know that he is a subject of grace, or that he ever will be. And therefore, he does not know but God is morally obliged, according to the threatening of his law, and according to his eternal decree, to cast him off forever. And should he, in this situation, stand and contend with his Maker, or cordially submit? I am now ready to meet the arguments or objections which you mention.

Objection 1.—None but real christians do exercise the virtue of true submission to God's will under afflictions, or in the prospect of them.

Answer.—This is said, and meant, as an objection against those who advocate unconditional submission, and is really the substance of all Mr. S. has said to refute the doctrine he opposes; for all the absurdities he endeadeavors to point out, as arising from the doctrine, are supposed to arise from the character and condition of a real christian. But this is fighting against a man of straw, of his own make. The advocates of unconditional submission, who understand themselves, freely grant, that it is only the subjects of grace, or the real christian, that does exercise true submission. I know indeed that Mr. Hooker and Mr. Shepard maintained, that a sinner under awakening and conviction must be willing to be cast off forever, in order to prepare him for regeneration or true conversion. This we acknowledge is an erroneous opinion; and no Hopkinsian that I am acquainted with adopts this opinion.

Objection 2.—If we suppose a person submissively resigned to future misery, we must suppose him, of course, to be a christian.

Answer.—Freely and fully granted, as being nothing to the purpose.

Objection 3.—We have, then, this incongruity presented. Here is a christian, resigned to future evil, which can by no possibility take place under the government of God. For God cannot, *without* a sacrifice of his veracity, permit a real christian to perish.

Answer.—Very true; but what then? Though God cannot permit a real christian to perish, and though a real christian, who *knows* he is a real christian, ought not to be willing that God should violate his promise, and cast him off forever; yet, it by no means follows, that a real christian, who does *not* know that he is a real christian, ought not to be willing that God should cast him off forever, if his own glory requires him to do it. And if he be not a christian, as he supposes he is not, he cannot know but the glory of God will require him to cast him off forever. His duty is precisely the same in his supposed situation as it would be if he were not a real christian.

Objection 4.—It follows, then, as the evil in question is not, un-

der the government of God, a possible one, that a supposed resignation to it, is not, and cannot be true submission; for true submission is resignation to present evils, or to those which are certain in prospect. This, therefore, is imaginary submission. It costs but little, and is worth still less.

Answer.—A real christian may exercise as real submission to a supposed evil, as to a real one. And if he does not exercise as real submission to a supposed evil, as to a real one, he is as guilty, as if the supposed evil had been a real evil. When Joseph's brethren came to their father and made him *believe* that Joseph had been torn to pieces, by a wild beast, ought not Jacob to have been submissive to God, under his *supposed* bereavement? And was he not *criminal* in feeling, and saying as he did? "It is my son's coat; an evil beast hath devoured him: Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces. And Jacob rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days. And all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him, but he *refused* to be comforted."—Though his son was not dead, yet he verily believed that he was dead, and that God had bereaved him of his darling. In this belief he was altogether inexcusable in refusing to submit to God, and to be comforted. And surely, if he had submitted to this supposed, or if you please, imaginary evil, it would have cost him much, and been worth all the gold of Ophir. The application is easy. A real christian, who believes he is not a real christian, ought to be willing to suffer that future punishment, which God might inflict upon him, if he were, and always should be an impenitent sinner.

Objection 5.—Imaginary submission can never be a real test of christian character. Actual submission only is evidence of it. Indeed, no state of mind which depends upon the future, can ever be at present, evidence of a christian temper. We appeal, and must appeal to past experience, or present actual experience only, for a test of our religion. Submission, then, to a supposed misery that is future, is no evidence to us of religion, unless that misery is so certain that it becomes *present*. But in the case supposed, the misery is not only future but actually impossible.

Answer.—Is it not a *present* evil, to expect, and fear, a future and eternal evil? Has it not been shown that a real christian, who does not know, nor think, that he is a real christian, has just ground to expect, and fear, a future, and eternal evil? His fear is not imaginary, but real; and his submission ought not to be imaginary, but real. His case exactly resembles Jacob's. He supposed his son was dead; and his supposition, though not founded in reality, was yet founded upon credible evidence, and such as carried full conviction to his mind, and laid him under moral obligation to be really and immediately submissive to the supposed will of God; yea, to the real will of God; for it was his revealed will that he should be submissive to him in the mournful situation in which he had really placed him. So it is the real will of God, that a real christian, who does not know, nor believe, that he is a real christian, should be at that time, whether *before* or *after* he has had a hope, willing that he

should cast him off forever, if his glory requires it, as he does not know but it may. I now ask whether unreserved submission to the divine disposal, is not directly calculated to remove the doubts of a doubting christian, and whether any thing else can remove his doubts? Submission in this case is the test, and the only infallible test to himself of his christian character. If a doubting christian comes to be submissive to God whether he should save or destroy him, he then has an infallible evidence that he is a friend of God, and that God is his friend, which must remove his painful doubts.

Objection 6.—There are other difficulties still, attending this speculation. A state of future misery, involves a state of future disobedience and rebellion against God. And we have already seen that submission can never be opposed to obedience. Submission to a state of future obedience is absolute rebellion.

Answer.—It is granted that present submission is inconsistent with present disobedience. No person in the actual exercise of submission to God, can, by that actual submission, disobey God. But how does it appear, that present submission to God, is inconsistent with future disobedience to him? Does not a real christian, in the morning of life, desire that God would not take him away in the midst of his days, but allow him to live longer in this world? But does he not expect, that, if he should live to the common age of man, he shall be guilty of more or less disobedience to God in that period? Is he not, then, willing, at present, to disobey God in future; And is his present willingness to disobey God in future, when he has told him that he shall not be perfect in this life, present disobedience? It is real submission to a certain, expected evil, which he hates in its own nature. But if a christian may be submissive to God, in appointing him to disobedience in time, why may he not be submissive to God, in appointing him to disobedience in eternity. Supposing God had told Lucifer, the day before he disobeyed, I have determined that to-morrow you shall disobey. Ought not Lucifer to have said, from the heart, I submit. Not my will, but thine be done? And had he felt and said this, would his submission to future disobedience, have been present, actual disobedience? I leave it to Mr. S. to solve these cases of conscience, which I have mentioned.

Objection 7.—But the question sometimes comes up in this form: If we could be assured, that it would be for the glory *of God* that we should be cast off, ought we not to acquiesce? And, in answer to this, I have simply to observe, that such an assurance is absolutely impossible. God cannot break his promises. God cannot change his character. It cannot be for his glory that those should be miserable forever, who are submissive to his will. Of what use is it, then, to state and reason from cases that are impossible ones, and subversive of the whole nature and government of God, if they should occur? Much more, how can it be a test of christian character, to conjecture how we should act and feel, or ought to act and feel, in cases that are actually impossible?

Answer.—It is readily conceded, that a christian, who does not know nor believe that he is a christian, cannot be assured that it would be for the glory of God

that he should be cast off; and it is asserted, on the other hand, that a christian, who does not know nor believe that he is a christian, cannot be assured that it would be for the glory of God that he should be saved. For God cannot break his promises, nor his purposes. The christian, who does not know that he is a christian, cannot know what God's purposes are respecting him; and therefore, it is his present duty to be willing that He should execute his purposes, whether they are in his favor or against him. His present state of uncertainty requires him to exercise present submission, whether his future state should be either happy or miserable. And his present submission or opposition to God, in his present state of uncertainty, is a criterion, to determine whether he feels *right* or *wrong* at present; but not to determine whether he is a real christian or not. For though he may feel wrong in his present state of darkness, he may afterwards feel right, as Jacob did, after he had refused to submit and be comforted.

Objection 8.—It is again asked, *Is it not the duty of those who are cast off, to submit to their condition?* And if you will only view this question as it respects different considerations, it is very easy to answer it. As to that part of the future state of condemnation, which involves disobedience and rebellion, it is no duty to submit to this, but to become obedient and cease from rebellion. And in regard to actual misery, fallen spirits are bound to acknowledge the justice of God in it, and their full desert of it. But it is their duty to repent and reform, and, were it possible, to deliver themselves from misery, though we have reason to believe that they will never do this."

Answer.—The spirits in prison are undoubtedly bound cordially to acknowledge the *justice* of God in punishing them forever, and cordially to acknowledge the *sovereignty* of God in continuing them in a state of moral depravity forever. And the cordial acknowledgement of both the *justice* and *sovereignty* of God towards them, I should call perfect submission to God both as to their sinfulness and misery.

Mr. S. concludes his arguments or objections against unconditional submission, with the following general observations, which deserve some notice:

"On the whole it is a matter of regret, that this subject has been agitated in our churches. It is easy to perceive that much has been said upon it, without definite ideas of the nature of true submission, and much said against it with mistaken apprehensions of the design of those who advocate the affirmative. What is aimed at, I take to be these simple truths—The will of God is the rule of right, and creatures ought to submit to that will—The law of God is perfectly just, and we ought to approve of it, though it condemn our conduct—We ought to feel that we deserve to be cast off, and it is mere grace which delivers us from destruction. To these truths we all accede. Why not inculcate them, then, in this simple and intelligible form, and not endeavor to impress them by the statement of cases, which are *revolting* to the feelings, and impossible in the nature of things! Most of the disputants upon these subjects seem to me to have left submission *undefined*, and not to have distinguished between active obe-

dience and suffering with resignation, or shown how the one stood related to the other, or that the one can never interfere with the other.

Answer.—Will not all those who are finally cast off at the last day, be constrained to accede, in their understandings and consciences, to these simple truths. "That the will of God is the rule of right, and creatures ought to submit to that will—That the law of God is perfectly just, and they ought to approve of it, though it condemn their conduct —That they ought to feel that they deserve to be cast off, and that it would have been mere grace, to have delivered them from eternal sin and misery?"

But will those who are finally cast off exercise any true submission? Is a sense of moral obligation to obey God the same as obeying him? Is a sense of our desert of being punished for disobeying God, the same as submitting to his hand and heart in punishing us? Is there any thing in Mr. S.'s definition of submission, that an unregenerate man, remaining unregenerate, may not feel and express? I regret that the doctrine of unconditional submission, has not been better defined, and more repeatedly, and forcibly inculcated in our churches, than it ever has been, and *especially of late.* "Young men think old men to be fools," but it would be well if young men would remember the last clause of the proverb.

SENEX.

ALL your hope, light and comfort, must be derived from one little book, which may be carried in your pocket.

CANDID REMARKS ADDRESSED TO CHRISTIANS ON THE SUBJECT OF THEIR HAVING CONCERN IN LOTTERIES.

THE writer of the following remarks has no wish to narrow the views or feelings of his christian brethren, or to prevent them from engaging in any pursuits consonant with their sacred profession. But the best understanding which he has been able to obtain of the subject of lotteries, has given him the conviction that a concern in them, whether as founders or conductors, or venders or purchasers of tickets, is among those things which, to the christian, are inexpedient and unlawful.

The several arguments which are urged in favor of lotteries, appear to him by no means sufficient to establish their innocence. The end which they have in view is often adduced for their justification. We are told *of* an increase to the revenues of government; of the promotion of works of public utility; of aid to the cause of literature and science. And it is true that lotteries are usually established for good purposes: rarely, and perhaps never, for purposes absolutely evil. But this fact is very far from rendering it certain that their establishment is either wise or innocent. Gaming-houses, and even brothels, have in some countries been licensed, and made to yield a public revenue; and thus, in a certain respect, have afforded aid to objects of usefulness. But what christian would therefore approve of them? Who does not see that the mischiefs arising from them, in other respects, must a thousand times exceed the trifling benefits which they are made to produce? And so the

simple fact that a lottery is established for a good purpose, may be utterly insufficient to justify its establishment, or to render it proper for christians to have any concern with it. If a lottery is an evil in itself, it ought to be entirely avoided. We are not allowed to do evil, that good may come.

It is true that professed christians sometimes have had concern in lotteries. And this has led others to think well of them, and to become interested in them likewise. But it is to be remembered that even good men have sometimes done wrong. And the very practice now referred to, it is believed, is an instance in which such wrong has been committed, either through want of consideration, or through that false reasoning which supposes the end to sanctify the means.

It has been said that the principle of lotteries is the same as that of insurance: and this has been adduced as another argument in their favor. But this assertion is certainly erroneous. The cases are widely different. The business of insurance is, for substance, the creation of a common fund, from which, by a previous contribution to it, those on whom the casualties of life fall, may be saved from embarrassment and distress. Insurance affords relief only where there has been loss; and affords it there, not at random, but on the principles of open and fair dealing. Nothing like this can be claimed for lotteries.

Some have attempted to justify lotteries by referring to that casting of lots often mentioned in the scriptures. But these cases evidently have no such resemblance as is contended for. That casting of lots mentioned in the scriptures was a solemn appeal to God, imploring his decision of matters in which his own glory was concerned, or which the human powers were thought incompetent rightly to determine. But so far as lotteries are an appeal to God, they are marked with profaneness. The matter to be determined is a few dollars, voluntarily placed at hazard, in the hope of obtaining a larger sum, without labor, and at the expense of others. Here is no necessity for an appeal to God. The very attempt to obtain wealth in this way, is a thing, it would seem, of which God must disapprove. And if an appeal is made to him, it is an appeal which takes his name in vain. And of this every man may be convinced by examining facts connected with lotteries, as well as by examining the principles on which they rest. From both sources he will learn that there is no more resemblance between the appeal made to God in common lotteries, and that made to him by the scriptural casting of lots, than there is between profane swearing and the solemnity of an oath.

In many well regulated communities, lotteries are absolutely prohibited by the civil law. Where such is the case, there is an additional reason why the christian should stand aloof from them. He is certainly under sacred obligations to obey the laws of the land. And how a professed christian can stand forth in the face of those laws, and let the whole community see him discard their authority, it is difficult to conceive. The influence of his example is evil, and especially on younger minds. Let the rising generation only act at large on the principle which he sanctions, and there is an end to

all the blessings of our free and enlightened institutions. And the same consideration is worthy of the serious regard of all other men of honorable sentiments, who countenance lotteries when prohibited. By violating the civil laws, they weaken the force of those laws on the whole community, and help to break down the barriers by which our dearest interests are guarded.—But even where the civil law allows of lotteries, it is not on this account certain that they are lawful to the christian. He has a higher law to which he stands accountable: a law that takes a deeper hold of his conduct, and exacts a stricter account of the moral influence which he exerts, than any of the rules devised by men. He has made a solemn vow that he will be governed by the law of God, and by that he will be judged. What, then, is the decision of that law on the subject before us.

For an answer to this question, consider a moment what lotteries are, and what are the effects which they tend to produce. Lotteries are a species of gambling. Some may not have been accustomed to view them in this light. But a very little consideration will show that they cannot admit of a softer definition. In every lottery, money, or property, is placed at stake, and those who place it there win or lose on the same principle precisely, as though the matter were settled by throwing dice, or by any other game of chance. It is of no consequence to the argument that persons who merely purchase tickets, do not themselves play the game. They stake the money, and then look on while a third person, with their consent and approbation, plays it for them. And how can a man justify himself in doing this, by any reasoning which would not justify him in sitting down at the gambler's table? Between lotteries and other games of chance there may, indeed, be a circumstantial difference; but the general nature of both is the same. It is alike true of them both that property is voluntarily placed at hazard; that, of the persons concerned, some win, and some lose; and that those who are successful, are so at the expense of others, without any virtuous enterprize or industry of their own. Lotteries, then, are nothing less than a branch of gambling. And this would seem a sufficient reason why they should be utterly avoided by every one who professes himself a servant of a holy God. Let every christian who stands connected with them, either as a vender or purchaser of tickets, or as a promoter of them in any other way, ask himself solemnly, if such a practice can be consistent with his sacred profession.

Lotteries, like all other kinds of gambling, produce mischievous effects. They are destructive of industry. It is evidently the will of God that men should live by honest labor in some lawful calling. And when they turn aside from his appointment in this respect, evils always ensue. But the whole tendency of lotteries, is, to turn them aside, and fill them with vain expectations of wealth without labor. The man who has purchased a ticket, must frequently visit the lottery-office —the place where he hopes his fortune is to be made. This consumes his time, and gives a check to his lawful business. He is likely moreover to reason with himself that if he should obtain the wished for prize, it will be more than sufficient to remune-

rate him for his lost hours; and hence he feels less concerned that his hours should be thus consumed. Pursuing this course, his habits of sober industry are gradually undermined, and are succeeded by idleness, and a reliance on chance for the means of subsistence, or for an increase of his property. It is not, indeed, every case which proceeds to this length. But that such is the tendency of lotteries, is too evident to admit of a doubt. And that, in many cases, such, to a greater or less degree, are their actual effects, is equally evident and certain. It is in the very nature of lotteries, to unhinge the sober and industrious habits of the community, and to lead men to seek a livelihood, without industry, at the expense of each other. And a system which merely has a tendency to such results, ought certainly never to be countenanced by a well-wisher to his fellow men.

Lotteries lay a heavy tax on that class of persons who are least able to bear it. The greater part of the tickets which are sold, are sold probably to the poorer half of the community. The splendid scheme which is held up to their view, and the specious representation which is given of the subject, inflame them with inordinate desires, and with unreasonable hopes, of a prize. They take the money which ought to be appropriated in other ways, and pay it for a ticket: which coming up a blank, their money, to them, is lost. They are not satisfied, but must try their fortune again. And this being followed by a similar result, they must try yet again. And thus their hard earnings are squandered away, while they themselves, or their families, are deprived of the comforts which might have been procured; and, in some cases, even while they are unable to pay the debts which they have already contracted for the necessaries of life. A fact related to the writer, illustrates this remark. A poor man was called on for the payment of a debt of sixteen dollars. He had not money to pay it, and could not obtain it. But it was known that he had, within a given period preceding, expended eighty dollars in the purchase of tickets, most or all of which he had lost. Probably other instances exist similar to this. Shall the poor be encouraged to gamble away their money, when they cannot pay their honest debts? And shall christians help to uphold that system of gambling, by which the poor are induced to pursue this wretched course? It may, indeed, be said that there is no compulsion used: that every man acts free. But, allowing this to be the case, is there no harm in holding out the temptation? Is there no harm in being accessary to the mischief, and helping to uphold the system which produces it?

It is true that occasionally a poor man draws a valuable prize. And there are instances in which such an one uses the acquisition well. But instances of this kind are not numerous. A sudden change from poverty to wealth, is far from being favorable to a man's real welfare. He, who is the subject of this change, is not prepared for it. He knows not the value of the property which he has received. He is perhaps lifted up with pride. And often his chief concern is to devise methods of spending what he has so easily obtained. A few hundred dollars acquired gradually by honest industry, are really

of more worth to a man, than as many thousands thrown into his hands suddenly without costing him any labor. And no man is in fact thought much better of by those around him, on account of the riches which he obtains by lotteries. The community will not feel for him that regard and esteem, which they feel for one who has acquired wealth by his own virtuous enterprize. They view him rather as one who is made rich at the expense of others, without any merit of his own: as the gamester sweeps the table, and takes the purses of his comrades, merely because chance, in its random movements, happened to fall out in a particular manner. Money, then, in lotteries, is collected from the many, and bestowed upon the few, without any regard to ability or merit, and in most cases to the material injury of those who gain, as well as of those who lose.

Other mischiefs not unfrequently arise from them. While the holder of a ticket waits for the day of drawing, he often feels an uncomfortable anxiety: and when the drawing is over, he often feels an uncomfortable disappointment, and envies those who have been more fortunate. And while these emotions, and others kindred to them which the lottery excites, agitate his breast, he cannot be a happy man: nor can these feelings do otherwise than leave an injurious impression on his character. And then, when habits of industry are weakened, and those of idleness are induced, as is too often the case, a great step is taken towards other kinds of gambling. The transition to them is by no means difficult. And these are very naturally followed by tippling and profaneness, with their attendant evils. It is not, indeed, meant that every purchaser of lottery tickets, runs this career. But it is meant that there is a tendency in lotteries to lead onward to such results; and that sometimes, in a greater or less degree, they actually do lead to such results.

The evils of lotteries, which have now been mentioned, have long been lamented by many of the wise and good. On the ground of these evils it is that lotteries have been prohibited by the civil government of different countries. And there appears abundant reason why they should be thus prohibited. In Great-Britain, where they have been sometimes prohibited, and sometimes allowed, since their first introduction there, they have been of late utterly abolished. A committee of the House of Commons, several years ago, to whom the subject was referred, "strongly recommended their entire abolition." "The evidence adduced before them," says a writer of that country, "unfolded a dreadful scene of misery, vice, and ruin, brought on by means of lotteries." And although the measure recommended, was not then adopted, yet the friends of piety, and virtue, and good order, did not suffer the subject to rest. They persevered, and have at length realized the accomplishment of their wishes. As a later writer, who denominates the system "manifestly unchristian and immoral," says, "we feel deeply grateful that the nuisance is now at length abolished."

From the "misery, vice, and ruin," produced by lotteries in Great-Britain, where the system has been longer pursued, it would be well for other communities to receive instruction. And especially where laws prohibiting lot-

teries already exist, it would seem, from these facts, to require much and careful deliberation before they are repealed. If the wholesome restraints established by our fathers for the good of the community, are, one after another, to be thrown off, as different persons feel them to be irksome, we shall soon lose the rich legacy which has been bequeathed us in our valuable institutions. And it is particularly to be desired that professed christians, instead of being found the patrons of lotteries, should, like their brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, exert a contrary influence, and labor for their suppression. It is time for the disciples of Jesus to put away evil, and to have no concern with any thing which is not praiseworthy and of good report. And to them the foregoing remarks are respectfully, and affectionately submitted, in the hope that they will lead to serious consideration, and inquiry after the truth; and that, so far as the truth is here exhibited, or shall be otherwise discovered, it may be obeyed. Earth with its little scenes will soon close, and eternity will be all. May every disciple of the Lord exert that influence in the world, which will be attended with the happiest results in the world to come.

THE ART OF IMPROVING LIFE.

It is astonishing how much more anxious people are to lengthen life than to improve it; and as misers often lose large sums of money in attempting to make more, so do hypochondriacs squander large sums of time in search of nostrums by which they vainly hope they may get more time to squander. Thus the diurnals give us ten thousand recipes to live long, for one to live well; and hence the use of that present which we have, is thrown away in idle schemes of how we shall abuse that future we may not have. No man can promise himself even fifty years of life, but any man may, if he please, live in the proportion of fifty years in forty:—let him rise early, that he may have the day before him; and let him make the most of the day, by determining to expend it on *two* sorts of acquaintance only, those by whom something may be got, and those from whom something may be learnt.—*Lacon.*

MISSIONARY ANECDOTES.

The following Anecdotes were related at the late annual meeting of the Kingston Branch Wesleyan Society (Jamaica.)

A respectable Bristol merchant, was waited on by a clergyman, to solicit a donation in behalf of a religious institution—he gave him 20*l.*

While conversing, a letter was brought to the merchant, and after having perused it, he said Sir, I must request you to return the money, this letter informs me of the loss of a vessel, by which I am deprived of 30,000*l.*—the clergyman did so—the merchant withdrew to his study, and returned with a bill of 100*l.* saying, Sir, take this money, my property is at God's disposal, and *if I will not give it, God will take it.*

—

A lady one morning, applied to some gentlemen who were appointed to examine the tickets of admission to a missionary meeting in England, and as she had no

ticket (not being a subscriber) they were obliged according to the established rule, reluctantly to refuse admission—she retired a few paces and again addressing the gentlemen said; I stated that I was not a subscriber, but I forgot, I am a subscriber.—I had one son, the prop of my declining years, *and I have given him to the God of missions.*

A man had retired from business after being very successful, but had become so penurious that he would not part with a penny to assist the poor.—From a variety of circumstances, however, this man was again reduced to indigence. He reflected in his poverty, how hard and unfeeling he had been in the days of prosperity, and vowed, if God did but raise him a second time, that a proportion of his wealth should be devoted to charitable purposes. God in his mercy did raise him a second time, but the rich man now became as hard hearted as before, and again he was reduced to want and indigence. Oh, thought he, with himself now, how justly do I deserve this load of affliction, could I, but be spared to become once more a fortunate man, I should never forget the hand that raised me from the dust.

In answer to his prayers, providence smiled upon him again, and he felt that sentiment in its full force. "He that soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly." He gave to the cause liberally—was raised to wealth and affluence a third time—and the end of that man was better than the beginning.

BRAINERD.

WHAT Foster said of Howard has been applied to Brainerd. The energy of his determination was so great, that if, instead of being habitual, it had been shown only for a short time, on particular occasions, it would have appeared a vehement impetuosity; but, by being unintermitted, it had an equability of manner which scarcely appeared to exceed the tone of a calm constancy, it was so totally the reverse of any thing like turbulence or agitation. It was the calmness of an intensity kept uniform by the nature of the human mind fobidding it to be more and the character of the individual forbidding it to be less. His conduct implied an inconceivable severity of conviction that he had one thing to do; and that he who would do some great thing in this short life must apply himself to the work with such a concentration of forces as to idle spectators, who live only to amuse themselves, looks like insanity.—*History of Missions.*

Obituary Notice.

DEATH OF MR. HALL.

IT becomes our duty to announce, that the oldest missionary of the Board has been called from his labors, and from a mission, too, which, as it would seem to a human observer, could not well dispense with his services. The missionary to whom we refer, is the Rev. GORDON HALL.

On the 2d of March last, Mr. Hall left Bombay on a tour for preaching on the continent, which he prosecuted with his characteristic zeal and enterprize, until the 20th of the same month,

when, at Dhoorlee-Dapoor, near Nasseek, at 4 in the morning, he was seized violently with the cholera, which, in little more than eight hours, terminated his life. These are all the facts, which have yet come to our knowledge, except that Mr. Graves, his surviving fellow-missionary says, he imparted suitable advice to those around his couch—prayed with them—and several times gave expression to his feelings, in ascriptions of praise and glory to God. The violent, the overwhelming nature of his disease would, of course, permit but few remarks of any kind to be made. He was attended by two native youths.

Mr. Hall is known to have been one of four young men, who, while members of Williams College, some years before the formation of the American Board, made missions to the heathen a question of deep personal concern, and dwelt upon it with feelings of interest, inspired and cherished by faith, and hope, and charity. Three of these —Mills, Richards, and Hall—are now dead; and, far from their native land, among the heathen whom they loved, lie the remains of the two last; while the bones of Samuel J. Mills were deposited in the African waves. They saw the answer to their prayers, and eminently were they honored in the instrumentality, by which that answer was secured. While American missions are remembered in the land which gave them birth, or in lands which they have blessed, the names of these men, and those of their associates, will be cherished, with an endeared recollection of their Christian heroism.

Among Mr. Hall's natural qualities, force of mind was the most prominent; and this he possessed in so high a degree, as to predispose and to qualify him for great undertakings. Connected with this, was so much piety and moral courage, as rendered him, by the grace of God, strong and unyielding in purposes of Christian benevolence; and, blessed with health, he held on his way, amid numerous trials and discouragements, until he thought he beheld the dawn of the morning, and saw the clouds breaking and the star of promise shining in the east.

It is to be noted, with lively gratitude, and not without admiration of providence, that Mr. Hall was spared to the mission, and to the Mahratta people, long enough to see the entire New Testament translated into the Mahratta language, and issued from the press, after very diligent and careful revision. This desirable and important object was attained just before he commenced the fatal tour.

The afflicted widow of Mr. Hall is now in this country, with her only surviving child, as is known to our readers. Of English birth, and of course a stranger here, and now bereaved, she will doubtless find an alleviation of sorrow in Christian sympathy, as well as in reliance on the "Father of the fatherless, and Judge of the widows."

Missionary Herald.

Ordinations and Installations.

June 23,—Rev. John W. Adams of Auburn Seminary, was ordained Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Syracuse, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Richards.

June 25,—Rev. Ebenezer Mason was installed Pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church of Brooklyn, L. I. Sermon by Rev. Dr. McMurray.

June 27,—Rev. Daniel H. Johnson was installed Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Windham, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Henshaw.

June 28,—Rev. Thomas L. Shipman was installed Pastor of the Church in Southbury, Ct.

July 12,—Rev. Vernon D. Taylor was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Elizabethtown, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hopkins.

July 19,—Rev. Augustus B.

Reed was installed Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Ware. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Snell, of North Brookfield.

Aug. 16,—Rev. Nathan Hoyt was ordained at Stillwater, N. Y. by the Presbytery of Albany, as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Clarke, of Charlton.

August 23,—Rev. Mr. Monteith was ordained Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Pearl street, New-York. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Rowan.

Ordained over the Congregational Church and Society in Spencer, Ms. Rev. Levi Packard. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Huntington, of North Bridgewater. Rev. John Wilder, Jr. was at the same time ordained as an Evangelist.

At Westfield, Vt. over the Congregational Church, the Rev. Silas Lamb. Sermon by Rev. P. Bailey, of Berkshire.

At Sutton, Rev. John Maltby, over the Congregational Church. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hoadley, of Worcester.

At Strong, Me. Rev. Jacob Hardy, over the Congregational Church. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Tappan, of Augusta.

At Stow, Vt. over the Congregational Society, the Rev. Raldin A. Watkins. Sermon by Rev. J. N. Loomis.

At Northampton, Ms. over the second Congregational Society, the Rev. E. B. Hall. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Ware.

At Rush, Monroe county, N. Y. Rev. Erie Prince, as an Evangelist, by the Genessee Consociation. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Whittlesey.

Sept. 13,—Rev. Thomas Vernon, was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Society in Rehoboth, Introductory Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Fisk, of Wrentham; Sermon by Rev. Mr. Mann, of Bristol, R. I.; Consecrating Prayer by Rev, Mr. Wilson, of Providence, R. I.; Charge to the Pastor, by Rev. Mr. Andros, of Berkely; Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Townsend, of Sherburne; Address to the Church and Society, by Rev. Mr. Cogswell, of Dedham; Concluding Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Williams, of Attleboro'.

Sept. 27,—Mr. Thomas Goodwillie was ordained to the office of the gospel ministry, by the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge N. Y. and admitted *as* assistant and successor *to his* father, the Rev. David G.

Sept. 27,—Rev. A. Brown was ordained over the North Church and Society in Hartford, Vt. Sermon by Rev. President Tyler, of Dartmouth College.

October 5,—Rev. Frederick E. Cannon was installed over the Congregational Churches and Societies in Ludlow and Cavendish, Vt. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Cannon of Gill, Ms.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received a communication from Xanthus, in answer to Investigator, which is written with candor and ability. But we think, that as so long a time has elapsed since the communication of Investigator was inserted, the discussion cannot now be renewed to much advantage. We think, moreover, that our correspondents have already gotten as near together on this subject as they are likely to come, and probably have said the substance of all they would say, should the discussion be continued.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III. DECEMBER, 1826. No. 12.

THE APOSTLES' DIRECTION TO THE AWAKENED JAILER.

A SERMON.

ACTS, XVI. 29—32. *Then he called for a light, and sprang in and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas: and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.*

[Concluded from page 527.]

IMPROVEMENT.

1. It appears from the case of the awakened and distressed jailer, that God is able to awaken and alarm the most secure, stupid and stout-hearted sinners, who think they are, and appear to be, the most out of the reach of all human means of conviction. There is great reason to believe, that the jailer was a stupid, bold, hardened sinner. Keepers of prisons are commonly men of this character. They need to be men of great strength, courage and resolution, in order to govern the most malignant, unruly and unprincipled members of civil society. The Apostles resided some time in the city of Philippi, and often preached in public, and excited much attention. A damsel possessed with a spirit of divination followed them day after day for many days, crying, "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation." It is very probable, that most of the inhabitants of the city heard the Apostles preach, and the jailer among the rest. But their preaching did not alarm his fears; it only, perhaps, excited his contempt, or opposition. But though preaching failed of alarming his fears and awakening his conscience; yet God by his providence, could produce these serious and solemn effects. When he made the earth to tremble under him, he made his heart to tremble within him, and constrained him to cry in deep distress and anguish of heart, to the Apostles, whose preaching he had despised, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" God has access to the hearts and consciences of those sinners, who disregard his word and his sabbath, and shun all religious instructions; and can employ his providence to teach them what nothing else would teach them. How often does God alarm those who hated instruction and despised reproof,

by some sudden or sore dispensation of providence towards themselves or others? God can at any time, make his providence effect what his word has failed to effect. No person or people are out of the reach of conviction. God can find out his enemies, though they endeavor to secrete themselves in the highways and hedges. God can go to the houses of those who refuse to go to his house. God can meet those in his house, and make his word sharper than a two-edged sword to their hearts and consciences. The case of the jailer, the case of Manasseh, and the case of the crucifiers of Christ, read a lesson of solemn instruction to all secure, stout-hearted sinners. God can lay them as low as he laid the jailer, and constrain them to cry for mercy. Is it not time for God to arise and plead his own cause while so many make void his law, and presumptuously pursue the path that leads to ruin! There is reason to desire and hope, that when the enemy comes in like a flood, the Lord will set up a standard against him. God's ear is not heavy, that it cannot hear, nor is his hand shortened, that it cannot save. God says to his people, "I will work, and who shall let it?" When God shall take his own work into his own hands, the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day."

2. It appears from the case of the jailer, that awakened and alarmed sinners need peculiar instruction. He was ignorant, and needed and desired instruction; and all sinners under awakenings are plunged in darkness and distress. Though they have gained much speculative instruction in their state of stupidity, yet when they are awakened out of stupidity, and come to realize spiritual and divine objects, they find themselves grossly ignorant of them. They find it is one thing to know God in speculation, and another thing to realize his being, his presence, his all-seeing and heart-searching eye, his purity, holiness, justice, and sovereignty. They find it is one thing to know in speculation, that the law of God is holy, just, and good; and another thing to realize that it is exceeding broad, and extends to all the thoughts, intentions, desires, and exercises of the heart, and requires pure, perpetual love to God and man, upon pain of eternal death. They find it is one thing to believe in speculation, that their hearts are depraved and that they have not the love of God in them; and another thing to realize that they are totally selfish, opposed to God and all righteousness, which is a constant transgression of the law of love, and renders all their thoughts, words and actions altogether sinful and displeasing to God. They find it is one thing to believe in speculation, that they are unwilling to be saved; and another thing to realize their sensible opposition to salvation, and the terms upon which it is offered in the gospel. They find it is one thing to believe in speculation, that time is short; and another thing to realize its shortness in the view of eternity. They find that it is one thing to believe in speculation, that they ought to love God and embrace the gospel; and another thing to realize, that they never will love God and embrace the gospel, unless he exercise his power and grace in changing their hearts. While awakened sinners are involved in

such darkness and ignorance, they need and desire religious instruction, and are ready to ask what they must do to be saved. The jailer asked this question, with great solicitude and concern. The three thousand, alarmed on the day of pentecost, asked the same question; and whenever God awakens sinners, they need and desire religious instruction, relative to the way of salvation.

3. It appears from the instruction and direction that the Apostles gave to the jailer, how ministers ought to instruct and direct inquiring sinners. They taught that awakened and distressed sinner, as the prophets taught and directed sinners; as Christ taught and directed sinners; as he taught them to teach and direct sinners; and as the case of sinners and common sense taught them to teach sinners; they therefore taught and directed sinners perfectly right; and all their successors in the ministry ought to follow their perfect example. They taught awakened and distressed sinners the knowledge of God, of Christ, and of themselves, by unfolding the great and precious truths of the gospel. And when they had enlightened their understandings and consciences to know their duty, they then exhorted them to do their duty, without any delay. They did not advise them to wait for more time, more light, more strength, or for a better disposition to do their duty; but exhorted them to do their known duty immediately, upon pain of the penalty of unbelief. They told them plainly, if they believed, they should be saved; but if they delayed and refused to believe, and rejected the counsel of God against themselves, they must perish. They proposed the only condition of salvation, and required them to comply with it immediately. They proposed no duty before their first duty to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. They allowed of no excuse for their depravity or impotency, but urged them cordially and immediately to obey the gospel. This is the apostolic and scriptural mode of directing inquiring sinners, which all the ministers of the gospel ought invariably to follow. But,

4. It appears from what has been said, that there is ground to think, that some, if not many ministers, are wise above what is written, and do not teach and direct inquiring sinners in the apostolic and scriptural manner. How seldom do you find, in the sermons you read, proper instructions and directions given to sinners under concern, and anxiously desiring to know what they must do to be saved? How seldom do you find them directed to repent and believe the gospel immediately? How often do you find them directed to read and pray, and *wait* for more light and strength to repent and believe the gospel? How seldom do you find in the Tracts you read, proper directions and instructions given to awakened and unawakened sinners? And how often do you find unscriptural instructions and directions given? How often do ministers in preaching to sinners, omit instructing them in the great and peculiar doctrines of the gospel; or if they do not omit to teach them such doctrines; how often do they contradict their instructions by their directions? They direct them to seek and strive after a good heart, and wait till God shall be pleased to grant them his special grace. Are these apostolical and scriptural directions? How often

do ministers in their private discourses with awakened and inquiring sinners, advise them to do a long series of duty, they do not and cannot say how long a series, before they make them a new heart, or repent, or submit to God, or believe the gospel? Do not some ministers publicly deny some of the terms of salvation, and explain away and lower down others, so as to make them appear pleasing to every unrenewed heart? Do they not direct sinners to do that, and only that, in order to be saved, which they are naturally willing to do, while remaining in impenitence and unbelief? I now appeal to what you have read, to what you have heard, and to what you know, in respect to the manner, in which some, if not many ministers, teach and direct awakened, inquiring sinners. Do they teach and direct either awakened or unawakened sinners in the apostolic, scriptural manner? Do they not virtually deny, or alter the terms of salvation, and teach sinners to pursue a course, which if they should follow, would prove fatal? There is but one right and safe way of ministers teaching and directing sinners, and that is to follow the example of Christ and the commission he has given them to preach the gospel.

5. It appears from what has been said, that ministers are under peculiar obligations to teach and direct awakened and anxious sinners right. They are the appointed and professed servants of the most high God, to show unto men the way of salvation. Christ, who has commissioned them to preach the gospel, has instructed them, both by precept and example, how to preach it. They are sacredly bound to understand and preach the pure gospel, and to teach and direct sinners in the only way to eternal life. Their spiritual and eternal interests are committed to their charge, and they watch for their souls, as those who must give account. They are responsible for all the instructions and directions they give them. If they teach and direct them erroneously, they may be accessory to their destruction, and their blood will be required at their hands. There is no part of their ministerial office more difficult and important to discharge wisely and faithfully, than that of giving right instructions and directions to sinners in distress. They love to be deceived, and love their deceivers. Their teachers are in danger of seeking to please them, rather than to please God. We know that this was the case in respect to the Jewish teachers. They often preached smooth things, and taught for doctrines, the commandments of men, and sinners loved to have it so. There were such men-pleasing teachers in the apostles' days, whom they condemned and sharply reproved; and there have been a great many of the same character since. It behoves ministers to take heed to themselves and to the doctrines they teach, that they may save both themselves, and those who hear them. Not only stupid but awakened sinners love to be pleased, and ministers too often love to please them. When they ask what they must do to be saved, they often mean to ask, what they must do with a sinful heart to get a holy heart; and many ministers are disposed to answer their question in this sense, and seriously undertake to tell them what they must do with a *bad* heart, to get a *good* heart; and advise and encourage them

to do it. Do they not tell them to go on, they are in a fair way, and will soon be converted? Is this mode of teaching and directing the awakened and anxious, agreeable to the example of Christ and the Apostles? Is it not criminal in the directors, and dangerous to the directed?

6. It appears from what has been said, that sinners have no right to ask, what they shall do to be saved, *after they know what they ought to do.* This we know is almost universally the case. After they have heard the gospel plainly and intelligibly preached; and after they have conversed with one and another, and with their ministers, upon the state of their minds, and after they have been plainly told and caused to understand what they *ought* to do, to be saved, and what if they would only do, they should be certainly saved; still they are ready to ask time after time, time after time, what they shall do to be saved. This argues something wrong in their views and feelings. It argues their dislike to the salvation offered to them in the gospel, and the terms upon which it is offered. It argues a criminal desire to be saved in some other way than that which the gospel proposes, and a determination to be saved in some other way, or not to be saved at all. After they have been directed and have *known* the only right way of salvation, they plead, and plead to be directed to some easier and more pleasing way of salvation, which is opposing all the wisdom and grace of the gospel. But have they any right to ask what they shall do to be saved, in any way *different* from and in *opposition* to the only right and possible way of salvation proposed in the gospel? Supposing, after the awakened and alarmed jailer had heard and understood what the Apostles taught and directed him to do, to be saved, he had still continued to ask, what he must do to be saved, if he neglected or refused to be saved in the way they had pointed out; would they not have said, you have no right to ask such a question, and we have no right to answer it. We have set life and death before you, and urged you to choose life, but if you choose death rather than life upon the gospel terms, you must die, for he that believeth not shall be damned. But after the Apostles had told the jailer what he must do to be saved, and he understood their instruction and direction, he *presumed not* to ask another question. He was satisfied, that they had taught and directed him right, and cordially complied with their direction. After the Apostles had answered the solemn question which the three thousand put to them, they saw that they had answered their question, and directed them right, and they immediately embraced the gospel, and presumed not to repeat the question, what they must do be saved? Sinners at this day have so often been told by books and by preaching, that they ought to do something that *is not their duty* to do, in order to be saved, that they all, whether awakened, or unawakened, think they have a *right* to ask what they must do, which is not their duty, or which they may do with a wicked heart, in order to be saved. But though ministers have so often attempted to tell them what that something is, which they ought to do from a wicked heart in order to be saved, they all suspect their directions and instructions are wrong, and those who are under genuine

convictions, *know* that they are wrong; yet their wicked hearts still prompt them to ask, with great solicitude and anxiety, what they must do to be saved. When they *know* their duty, they have no right to ask what they shall do, which is not their duty. They often make a self-righteousness of asking this question. The famous Mr. Tennant viewed this question in this light. He had a brother under deep concern, who repeatedly came to hear him converse on his distressing case, accordingly he conversed with him time after time, and instructed and directed him, in respect to his immediate and important duty; but he was not satisfied, and came time after time to be instructed and directed. At length Mr. Tennant suspected, that he made a self-righteousness of inquiring so often to know his duty, after he had been told. Accordingly, one morning when his brother came into his study, he looked at him with a stern countenance, and said, be gone, be gone, I have no more to say to you. This had its proper effect, and thew him into the hands of God, and proved the means of his salvation. Sinners have no right to ask what they must do, before they do their duty which they know.

Finally, it appears from the whole tenor of this discourse, that all sinners are in a very guilty and deplorable condition. They are by nature, totally depraved and under the dominion of sin, and exposed to eternal death. While they are stupid, they are ignorant of their guilt and danger. After they are awakened to realize their wretched and hazardous situation, they are like the alarmed jailer; they know not what to do to escape the wrath to come. They apply to those whose office and duty it is, to instruct and direct them. If they are properly instructed and directed, their hearts rise against the terms of salvation, and their duty to comply with them, and persist in seeking and striving to obtain regenerating grace, and will continue to seek and strive until they perish, unless they are discouraged, or unless God, in sovereignty, bows their wills to the sceptre of Christ. But if they are *improperly* taught and directed, they will seek in error with avidity, and pursue a pleasing path to destruction, unless God interposes, enlightens, convinces, and converts them. But God is under no obligation to awaken the secure, or to convince the awakened, or to convert the convinced. They say unto God depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. They deserve to be left to pine away in their iniquities; and is not God practically saying, "Let them alone?" You may read the Bible, but you will either misunderstand or pervert it, in order to find an excuse for the neglect of duty. You may ask and be told, what you must do to be saved, but you will still neglect your known duty, and seek and strive to find an excuse for your neglect. You will certainly, unless God exert his unpromised power and grace, choose and walk in the road to ruin. Neither men, nor means, can prevent your destruction. You are in the hand of God, as the clay is in the hand of the potter, who has a right to save or destroy you, as he shall see to be most for his glory. Can you realize this, and be easy and unconcerned? You cannot. No sinner ever could. The jailer could not. Manasseh could not. The crucifiers of Christ

could not. The day of distress is coming. Prepare to meet your God, before it be too late. "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself: but if thou scornest thou alone shalt bear it."

For the Christian Magazine.

EXPOSITION OF HEBREWS, IV. CHAP.

The nature and design of the argument in the fourth chapter of Hebrews, with a translation of ver. 1—11.

TRANSLATION.

WHEREFORE let us fear, lest a promise being left of entering into his rest, any of you should fail of it. For to us the promise was announced as well as to them; but the promise did not profit them, not being received in faith by those who heard it. But we, who believe, enter into rest, as the scripture says; "So I sware in my indignation they shall not enter into my rest;" namely, (rest from) the works which were completed at the beginning of the world. For he spoke in a certain place of the seventh day, thus, "And God rested the seventh day from all his works;" and again, in the (Psalm) aforesaid, "They shall not enter into my rest." Since then it remains that some must enter into it, and they, to whom the promise was addressed, entered not in because of unbelief, (it follows that believers enter into it.) Again he specifies a particular time, "To-day," (saying this by David, after so long a time, as has been mentioned,) "To-day, whilst ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Now if Joshua had given them rest, he would not afterwards have spoken of another day. Therefore, there remains a rest for the people of God. For he, who hath entered into his,—God's rest,—he also ceases from his labours, as God did from his.

Let us therefore strive to enter into that rest, lest any should perish after the like example of unbelief.

THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE ARGUMENT.

In the preceding chapters, the Apostle has warned the Hebrews against apostatizing from Christianity through unbelief. This warning he enforced, by quoting from the 95th Psalm, the language which David, for a like purpose, addressed to the Israelites of his day. The quotation ends thus, "So I sware in my indignation they shall not enter into my rest." After showing that this threatening had been executed upon the ancient Israelites, for their unbelief; the writer warns his readers against bringing upon themselves the like evils, by disbelieving the gospel.

But, prone to understand the threatenings and promises of God in a *temporal* sense only, the Hebrews might say, The rest, here spoken of, means quiet possession of the promised land, and not spiritual rest, such as the gospel proffers. Besides, it is not asserted, they might say, that believers only enter into that rest, therefore the quotation does not apply to us.

The writer proceeds, in the passage just exhibited, to answer these objections. He asserts that the rest spoken of is promised to believers under the gospel, as well as to the ancient Israelites. For we have received the promise, says he, as well as they. That is, the promise of spiritual rest. But they were excluded

from this rest, on account of unbelief. And unbelief will produce the *same* effect at the present day. It is only *believers*, who enter the promised rest. This is implied in the declaration, "So I sware in my indignation they shall not enter into my rest;" for it was made concerning those who believed not, who tempted God, and always erred in their hearts. Now if such were *excluded* from the promised rest, the natural inference is, that those of an opposite character are *admitted* to it. Just as from the declaration, "He that believeth not shall be damned," we necessarily infer that believers will be saved.

To correct the erroneous opinion entertained by the Hebrew christians, that, by the promised rest was meant the peaceful residence of the Israelites in Canaan, the Apostle proceeds in the following verse, to explain the nature of the rest in question. But we, who believe, says he, enter into rest; as he said, So I sware in my indignation they (that is, unbelievers) shall not enter into my rest; namely, (rest from) the works completed at the beginning of the world.—In other words, such rest as God enjoyed, after the work of creation was finished. The writer means to say, that when God spoke of *his rest*, he referred to such rest as this; for he then quotes a passage of scripture in order to illustrate it. He spoke in a certain place of the seventh day, thus, And God rested the seventh day from all his works. Consequently the rest spoken of is spiritual, for other rest cannot be predicated of God.

To impress this truth, however, more deeply, the writer repeats what he had before said. Again, that is, in the place of scripture already quoted, *it is* said, ye shall not enter into *my rest*, meaning such rest as God enjoys.

I may now add, that the Apostle is justified in thus defining the phrase, *my rest;* for this phrase is never used when God speaks of giving the Israelites quiet possession of Canaan. His language, when speaking of this, is, "For ye are not come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God giveth you. But when ye go over Jordan and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about you. Here, rest does not mean, in itself, the possession of Canaan, but simply freedom from the hostility of enemies. Besides, the oath, by which the Israelites were excluded from Canaan, is expressed thus, in the passage from which the Psalmist *quotes;* "Doubtless ye shall not come into the land which I sware to make you dwell therein." He does not say *rest*, but *land*. There is, then, no instance in scripture, in which the quiet possession of Canaan is called *my rest*. Hence the writer, with propriety, makes the passage, "So I sware in my indignation they shall not enter into my rest," *emphatic*, in order to show that *my rest*, means *spiritual* rest, such as God enjoys.

He next adverts to the conclusion before drawn from this passage, namely, that *believers* only are admitted to the rest of God; and then proceeds to establish more firmly the fact, that the Psalmist, in the quotation, intended rest of a spiritual nature. For, says he, David specifies a particular time, saying, "To-day, after so long a time, whilst ye hear his voice, harden not your

hearts;" alluding to the whole passage from the 95th Psalm, which had been quoted. For, says he, if Joshua had given them rest, (that is, the rest alluded to,) David would not afterwards have spoken of another time, namely, of entering into it. But David has threatened the men of his day with exclusion from the rest of God, as their fathers were excluded from it, if, like them, they hardened their hearts, and would not harken to the voice of God. There would have been no propriety in doing this, if the rest alluded to, meant a quiet residence of the Israelites in the land of Canaan; for they had already been in possession of it five centuries, and how could David say, *To-day*, if you cherish unbelief, it will prevent you from entering the promised land? The Psalmist, therefore, had reference to happiness of a more exalted nature. Consequently, adds the Apostle, there remains a rest for the people of God; that is, a spiritual, glorious rest, such as God enjoys. But, to remove all doubt on the subject, the writer adds, For he, who hath entered into his, that is God's, rest, he also ceased from his labors, as God did from his. Let us, therefore, strive to enter into that rest, lest any should perish after the like example of unbelief.

Such is the Apostle's reasoning. He first states the fact, that the same rest is proffered to christians, which was promised to the ancient Israelites, and that it is such a rest as *believers* only are permitted to enjoy. He then explains its nature, and by reasoning out of the scripture, and showing how the Psalmist understood it, proves it to be a spiritual, heavenly rest. In doing this he establishes the fact, that, under the Jewish dispensation, the same rest was promised to believers, which is proffered to them by the gospel; namely, spiritual, heavenly enjoyment: upon this fact rests the whole fabric of his reasoning. For, if the ancient Israelites failed of *such* a rest through unbelief, it was much to the writer's purpose, to hold them up as a warning to the Hebrew christians. It was saying to them, Here you behold the consequences of unbelief. It not merely caused your ancestors to perish in the wilderness and fail of the *promised land;* it debarred them from a better, even a heavenly country, from the New Jerusalem, the *rest of God.* If unbelief is cherished, its influence upon *you* will be equally *fatal;* it will exclude you from *heaven.* B.

For the Christian Magazine.

N.'S REPLY TO J. ANONA.

Messrs. Editors,—I find in your Number for September last, a reply to a piece of mine upon the question, 'Whether saints ought to pray for perfection in holiness in this life?' which you were so good as to insert in your June Number. I meant to state the question plainly and intelligibly. I said it did not imply, that saints ought *not to desire* to be perfectly holy, nor *that God did not require* them to be perfectly holy, in this life, but only that they ought not to *pray* that God would *make* them perfectly holy, before they leave the world. The writer of the Reply makes some serious, not to say severe, remarks upon the sentiment I advanced and upon the ground upon which I founded my opinion and drew my inferences. I have been considerably acquainted with Calvinists, and I

am satisfied that they generally maintain the opinion, that God has *determined* not to make any saints perfectly holy in their present probationary state; and that this is their general opinion, I still take for granted, without offering a single argument to prove it. But I think the Bible affords abundant evidence, that *God has determined not to make any saints perfectly holy, this side of eternity.* I confidently rest my belief of this truth upon the few following passages of Scripture. Job, ix. 20, If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me: if I say I am *perfect*, it shall also prove me perverse. 1 Kings, viii. 46, For there is no man that sinneth not. Prov. xx. 9, Who can say, I have made my heart *clean*, I am *pure from my sin.* Eccl. vii. 20, For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not. Phil. iii. 12, 13, Not as though I had already attained, *either were already perfect;* but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended.——Since neither Job, nor Solomon, nor Paul attained to perfection in holiness before they died, there is no scriptural ground to believe, that God ever has made, or ever will make any mere man perfectly holy in this life. The consequence appears plain and irresistible, that saints have no right to *pray*, that God would make them perfectly holy in their present state of probation.

If I have proved, that God has determined not to make christians perfectly holy in this world, and if I have proved, that it is not their duty to pray for sinless perfection before they die; then I think I have fairly and fully refuted two great and dangerous errors, which are more or less prevailing at the present day. One is, that of the Methodists, who maintain that some christians do actually attain to perfection in holiness, in this life; and the other is, that if christians pray in *faith* for perfection in holiness, or for any other favor, the particular favor they shall pray for, will certainly be granted.

I hope what I have now written will satisfy the mind of the writer of the Reply: but if it does not, and he should be disposed to write again, I would just hint to him, that it is possible he may receive a Rejoinder, which will smell so strong of the lamp as to offend his tender nerves.

N.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XIII.

So they went on, conversing of the dangers of the way, and of the terrible conflict which the pilgrim Christian had here with the fiend Apollyon; and the slips he got in going down into the valley, which were the occasion of it, till they came to a place where another road came into their way from the left hand which appeared to be much more beaten than their own path. And as they were considering it, they saw three men coming along this road whom they thought they knew by their gait. So they stopped till they came up, and they proved to be, as they had supposed, their old companions, whom they had left behind at the village of Careless, to wit: Feel-well, Love-self and No-law.

Then Feel-well, who was the foremost, came forward, and shook them cordially by the hand, saying,

How do you do brethren? I am glad to see you again. We have overtaken you, it seems, though we staid behind a little. I conclude we walk faster than you.

Ard. That may be indeed, for we have made but poor progress to day.

No-law. Aye, aye, I understand it. You that will be so precise, are likely to be stumbled at every stone in your path. But we get along bravely.

Feel-w. Yes, that we do. And we have had a charming time, since we saw you. I wish you had been with us to share our enjoyments.

Th. We have had some enjoyments too, such as the world cannot give nor take away. But we have had some trials, through our own folly, and have been led out of our path, to our great hindrance and damage.—But the Lord of the way has mercifully delivered us, and restored us to the right way ag[illegible] But you seem to have been led out of the way too; for you came in now by another road from the left hand.

Feel-w. We have not come by your path, indeed. And it was well we have not, as appears by your account; for we have had no trouble at all except coming up the hill Difficulty, which we found rather steep.—But we took our own time for it, and got up without much fatigue.

Love-s. I am very glad we were not in company with you, in your troubles. Perhaps we should have been involved in them too. But we have got along very well so far.

Ard. But where did you get into this road by which you came, if you ascended the hill Difficulty? I had thought it was the same that turned out on the left hand, at the other side of that hill.

Feel-w. No, that is the path to Destruction. We had no inclination to go in that. But this leads from the house Beautiful, where we lodged last night.

Ard. You mean the new house on the left hand, a little out of the road just after you had got up the steepest part of the hill, with the name on it in large letters.

Feel-w. Yes; the ladies told us that the old house had gone to decay, and they had built this new one, for the better accommodation of pilgrims.

Ard. They are deceivers. Their true names are Hypocrisy, Carnal-Policy and Heresy. The old house is not decayed at all, and is never likely to decay, being built of living stones. We lodged one night at each house, and found a vast difference between them.

Feel-w. I cannot believe they are deceivers. Their conversation suited me very well; and I enjoyed myself in their company remarkably. I could have been willing to spend my days there, but only that I wish to be going on to the celestial city.

Love-s. I cannot believe they are deceivers. It must be some slander upon them. They certainly keep a very good house.

No-l. I care not who they are, since I had a very pleasant evening, a good supper, and a comfortable night's lodging.

Th. But how came you into this road? Why did you not keep along to the summit of the hill? You would then have seen that

the old house Beautiful yet stands, without any appearance of decay.

Feel-w. The ladies told us that path was bad, and travelled by none but a few bigoted people who were for having every thing after the old way. They put us into this road which leads, with a slight bend to the left, from the back part of their house, and which is travelled, as we perceive, much more than the way you came. The descent too into the valley of Humiliation, is not so great, they said, by this path, and is moreover, as we found, provided with good steps, so that there is no danger of slipping, as there is in the old path which has often proved so disastrous to pilgrims. We have found it safe and easy.—And as it has led us here to the same place where you are, I see no reason why we should not prefer it. There are more ways than one to the celestial city.

No-l. Yes; there are a great many ways to the celestial city; and if I get there, as I am well assured I shall, I do not see what difference it will make by what path I came.

Love-s. I do not like to go far from the straight path, lest I should loose my way entirely, and never reach the city. But while I keep as near it as we have this time, even if your path is the right one, it gives me no trouble.

Th. From your loose manner of talking about the way, I should conclude you had been at the new house, and received some lessons from her that assumes the name of Charity. You talk very much in her manner.

Feel-w. We did indeed discourse with her, as well as with Piety and Prudence; and were well pleased with the instructions they gave us. I know not which I liked best, Piety or Charity.

Th. What did you like so well in her that was called Piety?

Feel-w. Oh, I liked every thing. She spoke to my heart. She cautioned us against entering into any unprofitable discussions; and requested us to talk only of those things which would increase our *good feelings.* And this was just what I wished to do. So we had a charming time of it.

Th. What did you understand her to mean by *good feelings?*

Feel-w. Oh, just such feelings as I have; happy feelings, joyful feelings. I know nothing about any other good feelings but such as these.

Th. No inquiry was made, I suppose, into the nature of those feelings, nor from what principles they proceed, nor to what actions they tend, in order to ascertain whether they are genuine or spurious.

Feel-w. Genuine or spurious! I do not know what you mean by such terms. Good feelings are good feelings; and no inquiry needs to be made about them. The great thing is to have them. If you only experience them, you will know well enough that they are good. I know they are good because they make me happy.

Th. I should think it of some importance to inquire into their nature, before I decided. I am sensible that I have had selfish affections, and I think I have had some benevolent affections; and I believe also that I have had many feelings which were merely animal, and just such as the brute animals have. I do not suppose they are all equally good. My selfish affections I consider sinful; my benevolent affections holy; and my animal feelings neither

sinful nor holy, any more in me than in the brutes.

Feel-w. You are too *metaphysical.* I do not like metaphysics. And you would condemn all my good feelings, as nothing, or worse than nothing. You are against a religion which consists in *feeling*, I see. I do not think we *feel* any too much. I have a poor opinion of a cold, unfeeling, speculative religion. I want a religion that I can *feel;* and I rejoice that I have such a religion. Glory to the King!

Th. I do not think we have too many right affections; but I do think we have too many wrong ones. And I fear that we sometimes place great dependence on those feelings which are merely animal, and think they are religious affections. I think all true religion consists in right affections; but if we consider all our pleasant feelings as true religion, I think we shall be in danger of deceiving ourselves, and perhaps fatally. We shall, at least, be in danger of thinking more highly of ourselves than we ought to think.

Feel-w. I do not wish to hear any of your speculations. I wish to talk on some more profitable subject.

Th. I think it cannot be unprofitable to examine ourselves, since we are commanded to do it. And I do not see how we can examine ourselves to any good purpose, unless we know how to distinguish right affections from those which are not. If we call evil good, and good evil, we shall be likely to come to a very wrong conclusion, after all our self-examination.

Feel-w. If I had as little feeling as some, I might need to examine myself closely in order to find it. But I have too much to be able to doubt, or to have any need of examining.

Love-s. I perceive that I shall not agree with brother Thoughtful, in his views. But I should like, nevertheless, to hear something more about them. Pray, what do you mean by animal feelings?

Th. I mean such feelings as we have in common with the brute creation.

Love-s. How do you distinguish them from what you call benevolent and selfish affections?

Th. By their being *involuntary.* Selfish and benevolent affections are *voluntary*, and are either sinful or holy. But animal feelings are involuntary, and neither sinful nor holy. The presence of some objects excites in us feelings that are pleasant; that of other objects feelings that are painful. And it is so whether we will or not. We cannot help having these feelings, unless we turn away our attention from the object whose presence excites them. We cannot look upon an object of distress without having some feelings of sympathy excited.

Love-s. But are not feelings of sympathy towards an object of distress something good?

Th. They are a natural good, like a good memory, or a good eyesight; but not a moral good, like love to God or love to man.

Love-s. How do you prove that they are not a moral good, and of the nature of true religion?

Th. The brute animals have no true religion; nor have they any sin. But the brute animals often exhibit such feelings, in as high perfection as men do. I have seen my dog manifest such feelings in a much higher degree than some men do. But I never thought my dog had any true re-

ligion. Most of the brute animals with which we are acquainted exhibit strong feelings of sympathy, when one of their own species utters the cry of distress, and hasten to his relief. And when he is relieved, they show that they sympathize also in his joy. If these feelings are not of the nature of true religion in the brutes, I see no reason why they should be thought to be so in human beings.

Love-s. But is not a want of feeling, spoken of in scripture, as a mark of great depravity?

Th. Yes. A want of benevolent affections, in human beings, is an evidence that the contrary affections exist in them. Selfish affections are sin. A want of animal feeling may sometimes be an evidence of great depravity in men, because a long course of wickedness deadens and destroys the natural capacity for such feelings. The original capacity for such feelings depends probably on the animal constitution, and is different in different persons, as their constitutions differ. Another great difference is made by the course of education and manner of life. So that two persons equally good or equally bad, may manifest very different degrees of it. But the same man will be likely to manifest more animal feeling, after he becomes a good man, than he did before, because his benevolent affections will lead him to take a greater interest in the welfare of others, and of course to direct his attention more to them.—He will now, more frequently than before, weep with them that weep, and rejoice with them that rejoice; because his attention is not so much directed towards himself and his own interests and concerns.

Love-s. I think the inquiry is rather too abstruse and metaphysical to be very profitable. But I like one remark you made very well. It is that our capacity for having these animal feelings may differ as our animal constitutions differ, and consequently, that, two persons equally good, may have different degrees of feeling.—Here is brother Feel-well, who has a great deal more feeling than I, but I have not been willing to think it was because he had so much more religion than I; though I did not before know how to account for it.

No-l. I think that remark must be right; for I have less feeling than either, and yet my faith is as strong, if not stronger, than theirs. Brother Love-self often has some doubts about his final acceptance, but I never have any doubts. And faith I think, is the sum and substance of all true religion.

Feel-w. Brother No-law always leaves out works; I am for both faith and works. But I am for good feelings above all.

Th. Faith and works are both necessary and so are *good* feelings. But the subject we are upon, was to find out what feelings, are really good. I have already stated my reasons for considering mere animal feelings as neither good nor evil, in a moral sense; that is, neither holy nor sinful. But our benevolent and selfish affections are often called feelings too. I have already said, that I consider benevolent affections holy, and selfish affections unholy. What do you say to that?

Love-s. I do not believe it. I believe that God has made us selfish creatures, and that it is impossible to be otherwise.

h. In what, then, does holi- consist?

ve-s. In love to God, and to man.

h. What kind of love?

ve-s. I do not know of but kind of love.

h. There are two kinds of , however; selfish and disin- ited. I may love God, mere- r his kindness to me; and I love him for his own excel- character, without waiting to re whether he is my friend nemy. I think holiness con- in disinterested love to God man; or rather in a disinte- d regard for all beings capa- f enjoyment or suffering.

ve-s. What do you mean by *terested* love? I should think terested love would be no at all. If I feel no interest nother, I have no love for I should suppose disinte- d love to be the same as in- rence.

h. No. The word *interest-* as two meanings. *Disinte- d* is opposed to one of these, *uninterested* to the other. If I am *interested* in the success particular enterprize, I mean my private interest will be noted by its success; or, I mean, that although its suc- has no connexion with my ate interest, yet I feel a deep ern for the welfare of those are engaged in it. But if I e to make the contrary affir- on, I should say, in opposition e first sense of the word *in- ted;* that I am entirely disin- sted in regard to that enter- e, because its success has no exion with my private inte- ; and in opposition to the nd sense of the word *interest-* I should say, I am uninterest- in that enterprize; that is, I indifferent about it. Disinte- rested love to God and man, is re- garding the happiness of each according to its real worth.

Love-s. Then it is impossible for any man to exercise it; for it is impossible for any man to know the real value of the happiness of God, or of his fellow men, or even of himself. And so he nev- er can regard each according to its real worth.

Th. Does God himself know the value of his own happiness, and of that of each creature?

Love-s. Certainly.

Th. Then God can regard each according to its real worth. And the true nature of holiness is to be ascertained by what it is in God. Men are no further holy than they are conformed to him in the temper of their minds. No doubt God regards every thing according to its real worth; that is, he is perfectly disinterested. And we ought to be like him in this according to our capacity.

Love-s. I am not so sure of that. God regards his own glory supremely; and why should I not regard my own happines su- premely?

Th. "God regards his own glory supremely, not because it is *his own*, but because it is *glo- ry.*" That is, he regards it above every thing else, because it is more valuable in itself than every thing else; and not because he is in the least degree selfish. And he requires us to make his glory our supreme object too, for the same reason that he does. It is written, "Whether, there- fore, ye eat or drink, or whatso- ever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

Love-s. I still think it impossi- ble for men to regard every thing according to its real worth; be- cause they never know the real worth of any thing.

Th. Perhaps my definition would have been better, if I had said disinterested love to God and man, is regarding the happiness of each according to its real worth, as far as that is known. The addition, however, is only necessary in order to guard against your objection; for nothing can be an object of love any farther than it is known. We do know enough, however, of God, to know that his happiness is worth more than that of all creatures, and ought to be so regarded. And we know enough of our fellow men, to know that their happiness is as really valuable as our own, and ought to be regarded accordingly. We do know enough, therefore, to make the glory of God our supreme object, and to love our fellow men as ourselves.

Love-s. If I am to love my neighbor as myself; then it is my duty to love myself; and so, some degree of selfishness is right.

Th. No. Your love to yourself ought not to be selfish love. If you regard every thing according to its real worth, as far as that is known, you will regard your own happiness in its due proportion. You will not overlook yourself, any more than you will overlook your neighbor. You must love yourself with a disinterested love. Selfishness consists in regarding our own happiness because it is ours, and in regarding the happiness of others no farther than it is conducive to our own, and for no other reason. If my love to God is selfish, then I love him for no other reason than because I think he loves me, and intends to make me happy; and if I did not suppose that he would make me happy, my love would be turned into hatred.

Love-s. Yes; and so it must be. "Can the criminal at the bar love the judge who condemns him? No; he cannot."

Th. He can, if he feels right. The judge does right in condemning him; and if he feels right, he loves righteousness, and loves the judge for doing right. But if the criminal is justifiable in hating the judge for righteously condemning him, then Satan is justifiable in hating God, who righteously condemns him; and all who are righteously condemned in the great day will be justifiable in hating God forever for doing right.

Love-s. This fine spun theory of disinterested benevolence will never do for me. It may appear plausible in theory, but it can never be reduced to practice. But my greatest objection to it, is, that if it is true it cuts me off. And I cannot bear to think that I have come so far on pilgrimage, and yet have no religion at all. No; I cannot bear it: *I will* not believe it.

Feel-w. I know it is not true. For, if it is true, I am no Christian.

Th. Is it safe to make our experience the test of truth? Ought we not rather to make the truth the test of experience? The truth will stand, whether it accords with our experience or not. But our experience will not stand, unless it accords with the truth.

My book says, "Take heed that ye be not deceived.—Let no man deceive himself.—The hope of the hypocrite shall perish.—Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith. He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool."

BUNYANUS.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

UNITARIANISM SOUND DOCTRINE.—*A Sermon preached at Waltham, at the Ordination of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, Feb. 15, 1826. By Nathaniel Whitman, Minister of Billerica.*

[Concluded from page 320.]

OUR readers, we fear, are tired of seeing the "Review of Mr. Whitman's Sermon" upon our pages. They cannot, however, be more so than we are ourselves. The passages, in this Sermon, which we at first marked as requiring animadversion, have led us into a discussion, altogether beyond our intended limits. Some of these passages remain yet to be noticed. We are obliged, therefore, to solicit the attention of the public to one number more of this Review.

The first passage, which we shall now notice, is the assertion of Mr. W. that Dr. Watts died a Unitarian. Speaking of his "Trinitarian brethren who would, had they the power, bar against Unitarians the sacred desk, the table of the Lord, and the celestial paradise," he presumes, "that many of them will yet see, and feel, and acknowledge that there exists between the Trinitarian hypothesis, and the word of God, an irreconcilable opposition. In this bright course of improvement, they may guide themselves by the example of the great and good Dr. Watts. This eminent divine and no less eminent christian, after having done more than perhaps any other man to give currency and support to the doctrine of the Trinity, was compelled by his prayerful study of the Bible to relinquish it, and to declare, as with his dying breath, that he could not find in the inspired volume this strange doctrine."

From what is here said of Dr. Watts, Mr. W's. hearers, if they knew nothing of the subject, would naturally suppose it to be an indisputable fact, that this great and good man did, near the close of life, actually become an Unitarian. But Mr. W. could not but know, that while Unitarians are continually asserting this as a fact, Trinitarians almost with one voice, contradict it. We know, indeed, that there was a time, when Dr. Watts was in doubt and perplexity upon the subject of the Trinity, and when he seems to have altered in some measure his mode of defending this doctrine. His "solemn address to the great and ever blessed God, on review of what he had written in the Trinitarian controversy," shows, indubitably, that his mind was then in an unsettled and anxious state in regard to the subject. But there is nothing in this which proves him a Unitarian. It is no uncommon thing for a mind like that of Dr. Watts, always upon the stretch after truth, to become confused and perplexed for a time.

But we shall be told that Dr. Lardner has asserted, upon the testimony of a Mr. Neal, another Unitarian, who was intimate in the family of Dr. Watts, "that his last thoughts were completely Unitarian." But what proof has he given of the truth of this assertion? Why, he says, that Mr. Neal told him, that sometimes in an evening, when the family were alone, he would talk to his friends in the family, of his new thoughts

concerning the person of Jesus Christ, and of their great importance, and that if he should be able to recommend them to the world, it would be the most considerable thing that he ever performed." But what if Dr. Watts had at this time some new thoughts respecting Christ? Does it necessarily follow that "they were completely Unitarian?" Is it certain that a Trinitarian cannot acquire some new thoughts respecting the person of Christ, without becoming "a complete Unitarian?"

The whole mystery of this affair may be, we believe, satisfactorily explained. The fact is, Dr. Watts did, as he supposed, in the latter part of his life acquire some new thoughts in regard to the person of Christ,—thoughts which Unitarians, and even some Trinitarians, believed would, if followed out in all their consequences, lead to Unitarianism. But all this does not prove that he was an Unitarian. It is a common thing for individuals to avow sentiments which are really inconsistent with others which they believe, without perceiving their inconsistency, or ever designing to relinquish their former belief. Unitarians often avow sentiments which we think are totally inconsistent with the truth of Christianity, without intending to take the ground of Deists. They do not admit the consequences which we draw from their sentiments, and consequently are not chargeable with them. Dr. Lardner and Mr. Neal, were both Unitarians; and when they heard Dr. Watts advance sentiments which they considered as inconsistent with the doctrine of the Trinity, they seem to have supposed that he was as ready to admit this consequence as they. They appear to have charged upon him their own inferences from his sentiments, although he never avowed them. This is a very common practice; but a very unfair and deceptive one. Whoever considers the fact, that Professor Stuart has repeatedly been reported as a Unitarian merely because he has expressed a regret that the word person has been used in speaking of the distinctions in the Godhead, will at once perceive how easily the alteration of Dr. Watt's phraseology on this subject might give rise to the report, that he had become a Unitarian. That Dr. Lardner's assertion, that "his last thoughts were completely Unitarian," is only an inference of his own—an inference, which, although perhaps honestly drawn by Dr. Lardner, Dr. Watts would have disowned to his dying day, we believe may be made perfectly evident. At present it is sufficient to show, that Mr. Belsham *allows*, that in regard to *Socinianism*, sentiments were charged upon Dr. Watts which he would not have admitted. His words are the following:

"His sentiments respecting the person of Christ, were thought by many to approximate very nearly to those of the old Socinians. But it is not certain that Dr. Watts ever regarded *himself* as a Socinian. On the contrary, there can be little doubt that owing to early *prejudice*, he would, to the latest day of his life, have started from the imputation with horror. How nearly soever his opinions might really approach to the Socinian scheme, possibly he himself apprehended, that he kept at an immoveable distance from it, by contending for a mystical personal Union, *by which a true and proper Deity was communicated to the human nature.*"

Now if Dr. Watts could be thought to be a Socinian, while he himself would have started from the imputation with horror, and really supposed that he kept himself at an immoveable distance from it, and still contended for a personal union, by which a

true and proper Deity was communicated to the human nature, we believe that he might be *thought* to be a Unitarian of any other stamp, "while he himself would have started from the imputation with horror."

But it is said that Dr. Watts left certain manuscripts which were supposed to contain his last thoughts on the subject of the Trinity, which his executors refused to publish. Mr. Belsham says, "Dr. Watts' latest opinions concerning the Trinity are supposed to have been contained in some papers prepared for the press, which were left to the discretion of Dr. Jennings and Dr. Doddridge, and which were committed to the flames, (very much, as the author of this memoir has been credibly informed, against the judgment and inclination of the latter,) *probably* because it was suspected, that they would give offence to the zealots of Orthodoxy."

On this passage we remark, in the *first* place, That most of the papers which Dr. Watts designed to commit to the care of Dr's. Jennings and Doddridge, he lived to publish himself. In a letter from Dr. Jennings to Dr. Doddridge, the former says, "I believe we shall not have so much trouble in publishing the Doctor's manuscripts as I expected, when he acquainted me with his design of committing them in part to my care, which was three or four years ago; for since then, he has published most of the manuscripts he designed for the press." The works which Dr. Watts published within the two last years of his life, which were undoubtedly from the manuscripts which he proposed committing to the discretion of the two above named gentlemen, and which of course must be supposed to contain his last thoughts on the subject of the Trinity, were the two following, "Useful and important questions concerning Jesus the Son of God;" and "The glory of Christ as God-man, &c." In the preface to the last of these works, Dr. Watts says, "Though we learn from the scriptures, that TRUE AND PROPER DEITY is ascribed TO THE FATHER, THE SON, AND THE HOLY SPIRIT, and they are represented often in scripture as *distinct personal agents;* yet after all our inquiries and prayers, we may be still much at a loss to describe exactly, wherein this distinct personality consists, and what is the distinct communion of each of them in the Divine nature."—— "There is not one sentence in all these discourses, but what is very consistent with a firm belief of the *divinity* of Christ, and a just and sincere concern for the most eminent and glorious truths of the gospel, as they are professed by Protestants among us, against the *Socinian* and *Arian errors*." Here we should think, was enough to convince any man, that Dr. Watts, whatever inferences others might draw from certain passages in his writings, did not at this period consider himself a Unitarian.

2. As it respects those manuscripts of Dr. Watts', which were left after his decease, although Mr. Belsham complains that they were not published; yet Dr. Lardner, another Unitarian, who had seen some of them, decidedly approves of their suppression. "My Nephew," (Mr. Neal,) "had the papers and showed me some of them. Dr. Watts had written a good deal, but they were not fit to be published." We know that Dr. Lardner assigns as a reason why these papers were not fit to publish, that "Dr. Watts had

never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject." But is it credible, that Dr. Lardner really thought Dr. Watts so incapable of writing on this subject, as to be afraid to have his productions made public, if he knew that he explicitly and fully avowed Unitarianism? No, this is not credible. The world knows that Dr. Watts, while he retained his faculties, was capable of writing intelligibly and reputably on any subject; and if he had at this time *lost* his faculties, Unitarians would gain but little, by proving that he then espoused their cause. The fact, therefore, that some of the Doctor's manuscripts were destroyed after his decease, proves nothing in favor of his Unitarianism. But

3. It so happens that a copy of one of these manuscripts, expressly upon the subject of the Trinity, has been recovered; "of which a small number was actually printed in 1745 while the author was living, but for certain reasons soon suppressed." In this, if in any, it may be presumed, we, have "his last thoughts" upon the subject of the Trinity. Whether he renounced this doctrine or not, we leave our readers to decide, after having attentively perused the following extract from the above mentioned copy of his works.

"The doctrine of the blessed Trinity, or of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with their peculiar characters and offices, is a special doctrine of the christian religion.—This sacred Three in the Trinity are plainly represented in scripture, and have been generally represented by christian writers, like *three persons*, or three distinct personal agents, as acting different parts, and sustaining different characters in the affairs of our salvation; and yet it seems abundantly evident also in scripture, that they are all three represented as having *true and proper Deity* some way belonging to them, and that the names, titles, attributes, and operations of God-head, are ascribed to the Three in the old testament, and in the new.—This is the substance of the doctrine itself, as revealed in the Bible, —and the writers on the Trinity have so often *proved* it, that I need not repeat the proofs here. Yet there are sufficient guards in the New Testament, that the ancient doctrine of the eternal *Unity of God* must have no inroad made upon it by christianity."

If this is one of the manuscripts which Dr. Lardner saw, we think the reason why he thought they were not fit to publish, sufficiently plain. Whatever Dr. Watts may have advanced in favor of the Unity of God, from which Dr. Lardner and others have *inferred*, that he was a Unitarian, "there can be little doubt," to use the words of Mr. Belsham, that—"he would, to the latest day of his life, have started from the imputation with horror."

Under his second general head, Mr. W. assigns the reasons why Unitarians feel themselves under obligation to preach their system. The first is given in the following words:

"We preach this system because in addition to its being inculcated in our belief in the general instructions and example of Christ, it is specially designated in the commission which comprises our duty and authority as ministers of Christ. This commission is in the following words: Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

In this commission our author says, "The system of Unitarianism, is especially designated." But what, we ask, does Mr. W. see in this commission, which teaches so clearly the system of Unitarianism? Does the fact, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are here named as distinct persons, irresistibly prove, agreeably to the belief of Unitarians, that the Holy Ghost is no person at all? Does the fact, that each of these persons are here spoken of in terms of perfect equality, absolutely demonstrate the infinite disparity between the Father and the Son? Does the fact, that precisely the same homage is

here paid to the Son and Holy Ghost, which is paid to the Father, establish, beyond a question, the fundamental article of Unitarianism, that the Father only is an object of supreme worship? Or, does the fact, that not one word is here said of the inferiority of the Son to the Father, not one word of the Holy Ghost's being a mere attribute or operation, not one word intimating that it is not as proper to worship the Son as the Father, make all these points of Unitarianism as clear as the sun? It may seem so to Mr. W. But we must be allowed to say, that christians in general, have always been favored, and we trust they always will be favored, with organs of vision on this subject, different from his. After having made such a stride as this, in his pursuit after texts to support Unitarianism, and to enforce the obligation of the Clergy to preach it, Mr. W. need not be confined to the proof texts *commonly* used by his brethren. Should he be again called to prove "the divinity of Unitarianism," he may avail himself of all the texts, which Trinitarians have heretofore pressed into their service. If, for instance, he would silence forever the pretence that Christ is God, he may quote the following passage from John. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." If he would prove to the satisfaction of every hearer, that Christ is not an object of religious worship, he may repeat the words of the Apostle's vision. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto HIM THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE, and unto the LAMB forever and ever."

Mr. W. has an *explanatory* remark upon the passage above quoted, which deserves to be noticed. He says, that "in this commission the peculiar doctrines of the gospel are designated by the author and finisher of the christian faith. These doctrines are the Supreme Deity of our heavenly Father, the mediation of his Son, and the operations of his Spirit." These doctrines, then, must be what he means by Unitarianism, in this place, as he has just said, "this system is especially designated" in the same commission. But is this all that is comprised in Unitarianism? It assumes then quite a different aspect here from that which it wears elsewhere in the Sermon, and becomes a perfectly harmless thing, and perfectly accordant with the belief of every intelligent Trinitarian. There is no Trinitarian, of whom we have any knowledge, that does not believe "in the Supreme Deity of our heavenly Father, in the mediation of his Son, and in the operations of his Spirit." Although there is not a word said in the passage from which Mr. W. deduces these doctrines respecting the *Supreme Deity* of the Father, or respecting *the mediation of his Son*, or *respecting the operations* of his Spirit; yet Trinitarians in general, and for ought we know universally, as fully believe these doctrines as Unitarians. And it is worthy of special remark, that the former, in their writings and preaching, make much more of "the mediation of Christ, and the operations of God's Spirit," than the latter. Although the language which Mr. W. has here used, does not distinguish at all between his belief and that of Trinitarians; yet

They will not only be more constant and devout in their closet duties, but they will manifest a higher degree of satisfaction in religious conversation, in the perusal of the scriptures, and in social prayer. They will have more religion in their families, will observe the sabbath with more delight and with greater strictness, will more generally profess Christ before men, and will commemorate his death and sufferings with deeper humility and more fervent gratitude. As a general thing, it may be expected that they will experience a much higher enjoyment in religion, and exercise much more fervent desires, that their fellow-creatures may become partakers of its blessedness. They will, therefore, be more ready to deny themselves, to make exertions, and to submit to sacrifices for the promotion of religion at home and abroad. Now we ask, does Unitarianism produce these effects? The question we now ask, is not whether Unitarians are pious or not, or whether individuals among them are more pious than some Trinitarians. It is, whether they as a *body*, appear to be decidedly *more* pious than Trinitarians as a body? If their system is the gospel, this is to be expected. To suppose that Unitarians embrace the gospel, and yet are not generally any more ardently pious than Trinitarians, who reject it, is to suppose that truth is in its effects no better than falsehood. To suppose that Unitarians embrace the true gospel, and yet are generally less ardently pious than Trinitarians who reject it, is to suppose that falsehood produces better effects than truth. We ask our readers, then, whether it is a fact, that Unitarians in general do manifest the traits of christian character, which have been named, in a higher degree than Trinitarians. Do their affections appear to be less upon the world, and more on God, and heaven? Are they the persons who take the deepest interest in religious conversation, who search the scriptures with the greatest delight, and whose spirit of devotion renders the duty of secret and social prayer a source of peculiar satisfaction? Are they more strict in the observance of the pious custom of reading the scriptures, and praying with their families, morning and evening? Do they take more pains than Trinitarians to "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?" Do they regard the sabbath more agreeably to the apparent design of its appointment? Have a larger proportion of them, than of Trinitarians, confessed Christ before men, and are they more devout and constant in the observance of the Holy Supper in remembrance of his sufferings and death? Do they appear to enjoy religion in a higher degree? Have they deeper feeling for those who appear to be destitute of it, and do they make greater exertions and sacrifices that such may enjoy this inestimable blessing? Are they warmer friends to the church of Christ, more decided opposers to fashionable vice and dissipation, and more zealous and active promoters of religion and morality? With our limited knowledge of the world, it is too much for us to presume to give an answer to these questions, with a design of its universal application. We can only say how things appear to us within the sphere of our own personal observation, what has been the opinion of disinterested witnesses,

and what have been the concessions of Unitarians themselves on this subject.

We cannot then hesitate to say, that within the sphere of our own observation, Unitarians, so far from appearing decidedly more pious than Trinitarians, appear much less so, even admitting that they are truly pious. The greater part of those who are the most in favour of Unitarianism have not made a profession of religion of any sort. Nor do they give any more evidence of experimental piety than the world in general. Comparatively few of them maintain the worship of God in their families. Instead of that devout and humble spirit, which appears to us a characteristic of every true follower of Jesus, their's appears to be the aspiring and lofty spirit of the world. Instead of governing their conduct by the example and precepts of Christ, they in general appear to make the maxims of this world the supreme law of their lives. A very large proportion of them are fond of vain amusements, and freely indulge themselves in them. We have frequently heard of their card parties and balls, continued at an unseasonable hour, and sometimes sanctioned by the presence of their minister; and we know it to be a fact, that amusements of this sort are warmly advocated, not only by the looser sort among them, but by many of their professors and ministers of religion. They are in general opposed to religious conferences, to social prayer meetings, and to nearly all special efforts for promoting a revival of religion. In almost every place within our observation, where a genuine revival of religion has commenced, it has had to encounter the opposition of more or less of those who call themselves Unitarians. We have ourselves known Unitarian ministers, who have laughed at conviction of sin and concern for the soul, and ridiculed those excitements which are termed religious revivals. We have known a number of Trinitarians who have become Unitarians. But in no instance, has such a person appeared to become a more religious or moral man. We have known a number of Unitarians who have become Trinitarians, and in almost every instance of such change, there has evidently been a very great improvement, both in piety and morals. Instead of showing themselves the warm and decided friends of the church of Christ, as might be expected they would do, were their's the gospel of Christ, they have become, in too many instances, the known enemies of the church. Wherever a contest arises in a parish respecting a minister, we notice that Unitarians are almost invariably arrayed against the most serious and devout part of the church and society, and very frequently associated in their opposition by Universalists, Deists, and Infidels. So far as our knowledge extends, the most serious part of the community—those who by general consent sustain the character of being the most eminently pious, *fear* the influence of Unitarianism, as that which has already begun to make havoc with the churches, and which threatens to lay waste the fairest portion of their spiritual inheritance. In regard to the subject of missions, Unitarians appear to feel but little engagedness; and from the circumstances in which this little has been excited, it appears to us more like a jealousy lest Trinitarianism should spread itself too extensively, and a wish to rival

the exertions of its friends in attempts to promote what is significantly termed a better cause, than a pure flame of religious zeal. It is well known that Unitarians in general were opposed to foreign missions, and that no movement in favor of this important cause was discovered among them, until the news that Mr. Adam, a Baptist Missionary in India, had become an Unitarian. This circumstance seems to have been the first thing that awakened their sympathies for the heathen, and led them to contemplate measures for their spiritual improvement. But with all their talents, and learning, and wealth, what have they done? They have written some pamphlets on the subject, they have formed a society, made a report, and some speeches. But we have yet to learn that a single individual has gone to aid this advocate of the true gospel in his arduous attempt to diffuse the light of Unitarianism amidst the Paganism and Trinitarianism of benighted India. While we should naturally suppose that Unitarians, if their's was the true gospel of Christ, would be among the first and most efficient heralds of salvation to the heathen, with the exception already named, we look in vain for them beyond the bounds of Christendom. Upon the supposition now made, we should naturally look upon Eliot, Mayhew, Brainard, Kitcherer, Vanderkemp, Swartz, Carey, Martyn and Hall, with the host of other kindred spirits, who have hazarded their lives for the name of Jesus, and for the salvation of men, were all Unitarians. But, it so happens they were Trinitarians. The system, which they embraced, is, if we are to believe Mr. W. "irreconcilably opposed to the word of God, and shakes to its centre the whole christian fabric." But still it rendered them more obedient to the Saviour's command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," than even the true gospel has its advocates. "Mirabile dictu."

But it may be said that we are interested witnesses in regard to the practical effects of the two systems. True, we are. But we will now appeal to the testimony of those who must be considered as impartial, in favor of the fact that Trinitarianism has the best moral influence upon those who embrace it. The following facts, as much to the purpose as any within our recollection, we quote from the sermon of Dr. Beecher, entitled, "*The Faith once delivered to the Saints.*"

"In an article on predestination in the British Encyclopedia, written, it is said, by Robert Forsyth, Esq. a learned civilian, and an infidel; after giving an account of the Calvinistic and Armiman systems, and the preference to the latter, it is said, "There is one remark which we think ourselves in justice bound to make. It is this; that, from the earliest ages, down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists and Jansenists, compared with that of their antagonists, the Epicureans, the Sadducees, the Arminians and the Jesuits; we shall find that they have excelled, in no small degree, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honor to their own age, and the best models for imitation to every succeeding age."

"In a periodical publication of high literary character, but of decided and known partiality to infidel opinions,† we find the following statements. "Predestination, or doctrines much inclining towards it, have, on the whole, prevailed in the Christian churches of the west, since the days of Augustine and Aquinas. Who were the first formidable opponents of these doctrines in the church of Rome? The Jesuits,—the contrivers of courtly casuistry, and the founders of lax morality. Who, in the same church, inclined to the stern theology of Augustine? The Jansenists,—the teachers and the models of austere morals. What are we to think of the morality of Calvinistic nations, especially the most numerous classes of them: who seem, beyond all other men, to be most zealously attached to their religion, and most deeply penetrated

† Edinburgh Review.

with its spirit? Here, if any where, we have a practical and decisive test of the moral influence of a belief in necessarian opinions. In Protestant Switzerland, in Holland, in Scotland, among the English Nonconformists, and the Protestants of the North of Ireland, and in the New-England States, Calvinism was long the prevalent faith, and is probably still the faith of a considerable majority. Their moral education was at least completed, and their collective character formed, during the prevalence of Calvinistic opinions. Yet where are communities to be found of a more pure and active virtue?"

Our readers need not be told that these Calvinists, to the good influence of whose opinions we have here so honorable a testimony, were Trinitarians. We have only to ask, Can Unitarians bring as full and decided testimony to the good moral influence of their opinions, from any individual, or body of men who disbelieve them?

But we have concessions from Unitarians themselves, which support our views of this subject. Although they seem reluctant to admit, that Trinitarian principles have made the best men; yet this is evidently implied in the writings of a number of them. Dr. Priestley says of Calvinists, "They have less apparent conformity to the world, and seem to have more of a real principle of religion." He allows that a "great number of Unitarians of the present age are only men of good sense, and without much practical religion,"—that their system is embraced by some "in consequence of their becoming more indifferent to religion in general, and to all the modes and doctrines of it,"—that "Unitarians are greatly wanting in zeal for religion,"—that "they do not lay so much stress upon their principles as other christians do upon theirs,"—that "they are less concerned to inculcate their principles upon their children, their servants, and their dependants in general,"—that great numbers of them in the church of England "countenance a mode of worship which, according to their own principles, is idolatrous and blasphemous,"—and that "the moral conduct of such persons is not what is deemed strict and exemplary."

In the following passages, Dr. Priestley not only acknowledges the piety of the Calvinists, but admits it to be the result of their principles. "Whether it be owing to my Calvinistical education, or my considering the principles of Calvinism as generally favorable to *devotion*, or their being something akin to the doctrine of necessity, I cannot but acknowledge, that notwithstanding all which I have occasionally written against their system, and which I am far from wishing to retract, I feel myself disposed to look upon Calvinists with a kind of *respect*, and could never join in the contempt and insult with which I have often heard them treated in conversation." Of the same people he says further, "There are many whose hearts and lives are in all respects truly christian, and whose christian tempers *are really promoted by their own views of their system.*"

Many concessions of this sort, although made with evident reluctance, and followed or preceded with others, which are totally inconsistent with them, are frequently found in the writings of this author, and clearly evince his conviction that the piety of Unitarians could not bear an advantageous comparison with that of Trinitarians. From the following passage it may be seen that his conviction of this was so strong, that he had no way to relieve his own mind from the difficulty with which it encumbered his system, and to satisfy the public respecting it, only by supposing, ro *ho-*

ping, that facts in this case are not as they *appear* to be. "Upon the whole, considering the great mixture of spiritual pride and bigotry, in some of the most zealous Trinitarians, I think the moral character of Unitarians in general, allowing there is among them a greater apparent conformity to the world than is observable in others, approaches more nearly to the proper temper of christianity. It is more cheerful, more benevolent, more candid. The former have somewhat less, and the latter I *hope* somewhat more of a real principle of religion, than they appear to have." Now we ask, why have we not as much reason to believe that Unitarians have *less*, and Trinitarians *more* of a principle of religion than they *appear* to have, as Dr. Priestley has to suppose the reverse. The success of Unitarianism does not then appear in any peculiarly good effects which it has upon the characters of those who embrace it.

The influence of this system, in relation to the public, is next to be considered. But we need not spend much time upon this part of the subject, as it must be evident to every reader that if its influence upon the individuals who receive it is not peculiarly beneficial, its influence upon the public cannot be. The effect which any system of religion has upon the community, within the sphere of its influence, must be substantially the same with that which it has upon those who embrace it.

If Unitarianism is the true gospel and Trinitarianism an opposite system, it may be expected that the former, when clearly preached, will make deeper and more serious impressions upon hearers in general, quicken and animate saints to a higher degree in their christian course, turn open and bold transgressors more frequently from the error of their ways, produce more frequent, more general, and more powerful revivals of true religion, and gather much greater numbers into the church of Christ. But what are facts in this case? Is it not well known, that the preaching of Unitarians does not produce so deep and so serious impressions upon people in general, as that of Trinitarians? Is it not an undeniable fact, that professors of religion, who sit under the preaching of Unitarians, instead of being more engaged, and active in religion than those who sit under Unitarian preaching, are much less so? Can any man of information be found, who will hazard the assertion, that the openly vicious are more frequently reclaimed by the preaching of Unitarians, than by that of Trinitarians? For our own part, we can truly say, that while we have known hundreds, of this description, who have been effectually reformed by the preaching of the former, we have never seen or heard of one, who was evidently made a new man by the preaching of the latter.

Mr. W. says, "It is, I know, often, and confidently said, that the influences of God's spirit do not accompany Unitarian preaching, and that pure and undefiled religion is to be found only under Trinitarian preaching;" and he thinks "that those who thus speak, must suppose that their hearers and readers are unacquainted with the history of past ages;—that they are unacquainted with present times, that they are incapable of making observations on facts before their eyes, and that they are incapable of understanding the scriptures of truth." We, however, have never

heard the above assertion made; and we doubt whether it is "*often* and *confidently* said, that "pure and undefiled religion is to be found only under Trinitarian preaching." But waving all dispute on this subject, we ask Mr. W. when, and where he ever knew an extensive and powerful revival of religion to take place and to be carried on under the preaching of a man whose religious *system* is the same with that which Unitarians in general attempt to defend, without changing the character of the preacher as well as that of his hearers? But could he do this, it would be little to his purpose, unless he could show, that Unitarian preaching is *more* frequently instrumental of producing such an effect than that of Trinitarians. But this he will not attempt. He knows, and so does every other man of his information know, that what are termed revivals of religion, are confined principally, if not exclusively, to congregations that hear the truths which Trinitarians believe. Mr. W. asks, "Were the ignorance, the vice, and the misery, which so remarkably prevailed from the fourth century to the Reformation the effect of Unitarianism?" We cannot say that they were. But we can say, that those who opposed the vices of this period, the most strenuously, and who attempted at the expense of life and fortune to prevent the ignorance and misery of it as much as possible, were generally, if not exclusively, Trinitarians. And Mr. W. will not deny that the light of the Reformation burst forth from Trinitarian influence. Again he asks, "Have those churches which now constitute the waste places of Zion thus sunken into ruins, through the influence of Unitarianism?" To this we reply, It has been, in our apprehension, the mistaken policy of keeping out of view, or half preaching, those distinguishing doctrines of the gospel which Unitarians disbelieve and never preach, that has produced "this wide spread desolation." But, by whatever, or whomsoever, these waste places have been made, it is Trinitarians that are the most actively and efficiently engaged in building them up.

Is it not an indubitable fact, that Unitarian preaching induces fewer people to attend public worship than that of Trinitarian? Notwithstanding the boasted liberality of the terms on which members may be admitted into Unitarian churches, is it not a fact, that these are generally smaller, in proportion to the number of their congregations, than Trinitarian churches? We do not know, with certainty, what are facts in this case, but we here ask, whether the number of professors of religion in the Unitarian churches in Boston, is not now considerably smaller, in proportion to the number belonging to the societies connected with them, than they were before they became Unitarian? From a letter of the Rev. Mr. Cooper, one of the Pastors of the church in Brattle-street, to his friend in Scotland, it appears that in the revival of 1740-41, about six hundred persons came to him, in deep concern about their souls, within the space of three months. Rev. Mr. Webb, then one of the Pastors of the New North Church, informed the Rev. Mr. Prince, that above a thousand came to him in a similar condition, in the same space of time. During this revival, about one hundred and sixty were added to the New North Church, and one hundred

and two in the course of one year. Now how many anxious inquirers have been known to go to the Pastors of these churches, since they have been Unitarian, or how many have been added to them at any one time, we know not. We would ask, however, whether Unitarianism has produced any such fruits as those above described?

If Mr. W. and other Unitarians, mean by the success of which they speak, the spread of their sentiments, we can understand them. We know that there has been a great increase of Unitarianism in this country, within the last thirty years. But what *good* this Unitarianism has done, we know not, unless it be a good thing to keep sinners quiet in their sins, to paralyze the efforts of saints, to diminish and divide our churches, to keep the heathen in ignorance of the word of God, and to remove from mankind the salutary restraints which the pure doctrines of the gospel are calculated to impose. These effects Unitarianism has, and doubtless will, produce. We are astonished, that such men as Mr. W. and others engaged with him in opposing Trinitarianism, do not see, from the effects which their doctrines do and always have produced, a demonstration of their falsehood. How they can see vital godliness dying away before their influence, the wicked triumphing on every side at their success, while the most devout and heavenly minded behold it only with emotions of grief; and see no evidence that their cause is not of God, is more than we can understand. If there is evidence that God blesses any system of religion, there is evidence that he blesses the Trinitarian system. If there is any system which has produced effects such as followed the preaching of the Apostles and primitive christians, it is this. If the world are indebted to any system, for that moral influence, which has imposed a salutary restraint upon the base passions of men; which has led to the establishment and given efficacy to just and equal laws; which has prompted to enterprises of the greatest benevolence, and led to results in which the whole human family have reason to rejoice; it is that which Trinitarians believe and Unitarians reject. If there is a system, which has given solace and comfort under the severest trials of life, rendered the hour of death peaceful and triumphant, and opened before the departing saint the most glorious prospects in eternity, it is this. What then, we ask, do Unitarians hope to gain by their efforts to promote an opposite? If the moral tendency of this has been good, will the moral tendency of an opposite be better? No. Opposite causes will produce opposite effects. The success of Unitarians is what both they and the world have reason to deprecate. Should it prevail, so as to feel no restraining influence from an opposite system, every species of dissipation and vice will follow its train, and—darkness—"gross darkness, will cover the people."

For the Christian Magazine.

UNITARIANS VERSUS THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Unitarians. Those persons deceive themselves, who, in the apprehension of death, *lay hold on the merits of Christ*, and expect to

enter heaven in consequence." (ChristianRegister, Nov. 4, 1826.)

Peter. "Neither is there *salvation* in *any other:* For there is *none other name under heaven* given among men, whereby we must be *saved.*"—"Through the *grace of the Lord Jesus Christ,* we *shall be saved.*"

Paul. "Being justified freely by his grace, *through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*"—"We shall be saved from wrath, *through him.*"

Unitarians. "Ministers do injury to the cause of practical religion, by using language which implies that *faith in the atoning blood of Jesus* is competent to introduce man into the regions of heavenly bliss." (Christian Register, Nov. 4, 1826.)

Jesus Christ. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up (or crucified) that *whosoever believeth in him should not perish,* but have eternal life."

Paul. "Being *justified by faith,* we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—"Being *justified by his blood,* we shall be saved from wrath to come."—"In whom *we have redemption through his blood,* the forgiveness of sins."

John. "*The blood of Jesus Christ,* his Son, *cleanseth us from all sin.*"—"Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood.*"

The host of Heaven. "They sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and *hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.*"

ANECDOTE OF REV. W. B. CADOGAN.

A MUSICAL amateur of eminence, who had often observed Mr. Cadogan's attention to his performances, said to him one day, "Come, I am determined to make you feel the force of music; pay particular attention to this piece." It was played. "Well, what do you say now?" "Why just what I said before." "What! can you hear this and not be charmed? Well, I am quite surprised at your insensibility! Where were your ears?" "Bear with me my Lord," replied Mr. C. "since I too have had my surprise. I have often from the pulpit, set before you the most striking and affecting truths: I have sounded notes that have raised the dead: I have said, surely he will feel now; but you never seemed charmed with my music, though infinitely more interesting than yours. I too have been ready to say with astonishment—Where are your ears?"

THOMAS HOPOO.

THE following anecdote is related of Thomas Hopoo, the friend and companion of Obookiah, who is now faithfully and successfully laboring, in connexion with American Missionaries, for the salvation of his countrymen. When at the Foreign Mission School, pursuing his studies, a Christian friend, who was on a visit in the neighborhood, expressed a wish to see Thomas, and to converse with him on religious subjects. Thomas was sent for, and the gentleman was much gratified with his ready and judicious replies to many questions which were proposed to him, on the Scriptures. At length his friend, to test his understanding still further, proposed the following question, which perhaps may, not improperly, be considered the

Gordian knot in Divinity,—"How could our first parents, who were perfectly holy, yield to the temptation of Satan, and disobey the command of God?" After a short pause,—"Ah," said Thomas, "I believe we have got beyond the Bible, now."—*Conn. Obs.*

Ordinations and Installations.

Ordained, at Gerardstown, Va. by the Presbytery of Winchester, Mr. JAMES BROWN, to the pastoral office in that place. Sermon by Rev. J. Matthews.

In New-York city, by the Presbytery of New-York, Mr. EBENEZER H. SNOWDEN, as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. J. D. Wickham, of New Rochelle.

In the West Presbyterian Chh. in Cedar st. New York, Messrs. WM. MCJIMSEY and ERSKINE MASON, as Evangelists. Sermon by Rev. Walter Monteith.

At Somerville, N. J. as an Evangelist, Rev BENJAMIN B. WESTFALL. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hardenburgh.

At Milledgeville, Geo. by the Hopewell Presbytery, Mr. JOSEPH STILES, as an Evangelist.

At Lewiston, by the Presbytery of Huntingdon, Md. Mr. GARRY BISHOP, as an Evangelist.

In Salem, Con. (Chesterfield Society,) Rev. NATHANIEL MINER, by the Consociation of New-London County. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Cone, of Colchester.

Oct. 6,—Rev. EPHRAIM RANDALL was installed over the Congregational Church and Society in Saugus, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Huntoon, of Canton.

Oct. 7,—In Jefferson county, Ind. as Pastor of the Jefferson Church, Rev. SAMUEL GRAGG. Sermon by Rev. John M. Dickey.

Oct. 25,—Mr. FREEMAN P. HOWLAND was ordained over the Congregational Church and Society in Hanson, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Holmes, of New-Bedford.

Oct. 25,—Rev. FORREST JEFFERDS was ordained to the pastoral charge of the Congregational Church in Epping, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Greenleaf, of Wells.

October 25,—Rev. JOSEPH IVES FOOTE was installed as Pastor over the First Church and Society in Brookfield, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Humphrey, President of Amherst College.

Nov. 1,—Rev. NATHANIEL BARKER was ordained over the Congregational Church in Mendon, South Parish. Sermon by Rev. Benjamin Wood, of Upton.

Nov. 1,—Rev. THOMAS M. SMITH was installed, as Pastor of the Congregational Church at Fall River, Troy, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Woods, of the Theological Seminary, Andover.

November 8,—Rev. HANDELL G. NOTT was ordained over the First Church in Dunstable, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Samuel Green, of Boston.

Nov. 8,—Rev. GEORGE RIPLEY was ordained as Pastor of the Unitarian Congregational Church and Society in Purchase-street, Boston. Sermon by the Rev. President Kirkland.

To Correspondents—We regret that 'W.' was received too late for insertion this month.

Correction.—In our last number, page 342, first col. line 28, for 'future obedience,' read 'future disobedience.'